

foster the establishment of a privately owned and operated American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALSH: Petition of the Congressional Union for Woman's Suffrage, assembled at the Twentieth Century Club, Boston, Mass., January 6, 1916, favoring passage of woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Stanley Woolen Co., of Uxbridge, Mass., favoring protection for manufacturers of dye-stuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 13, 1916.

Rev. Boyd V. Switzer, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we bless Thee for the courage, wisdom, and self-sacrifice of our forefathers who gave to us civic, political, and religious liberty. We bless Thee that our people still cherish and value above all earthly possessions that sacred, blood-bought heritage of constitutional liberty. Therefore, in these perilous times, when our inalienable rights to life, liberty, and property are being jeopardized, we pray Thee, O Lord, that Thou wouldst so inspire and guide those in authority in these United States that peace may be preserved, individual security guaranteed, and our national honor preserved inviolate.

Do Thou, we pray Thee, in the midst of these years and these times breathe upon us such strength, wisdom and power from above that we may possess clear discernment, and that self-poise and fine sanity which will make us workmen of whom God need not be ashamed. In Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

COPPER EXPORT TRADE.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, an article was printed in the New York World of yesterday so extraordinary in its character that, although somewhat lengthy, I send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

BRITAIN DEMANDS TRADE SECRETS OF UNITED STATES CORPORATIONS—METAL CONCERNS, ESPECIALLY COPPER COMPANIES, NOTIFIED TO GIVE LISTS OF STOCKHOLDERS, ADDRESSES, NATIONALITY, NUMBER OF SHARES EACH OWNS, AND CLIENTS, TOO—NO OPEN THREAT MADE, BUT ENEMY ACT IS CITED—PUTS FIRMS AT MERCY OF BRITISH, OFFICIALS SAY, FOR GERMANS ARE CONNECTED WITH MANY—SUSPECT BUSINESS TRICK—MAY REFUSE TO COMPLY—TO APPEAL TO WASHINGTON.

American metal corporations, particularly those whose principal business is the export of copper, have been "requested," by direction of the British Government, through their agents or other representatives in Great Britain, to furnish that Government with information concerning their companies and the business conducted by them of such intimate a character as the Government of the United States itself never has required corporations to give.

In demanding this information the British Government makes no announcement of what its action will be in regard to a corporation refusing to comply. No hint of punitive measures is conveyed, unless the fact that attention is directed to the newly amended trading-with-the-enemy act be so considered.

ASKS STOCKHOLDERS' LISTS.

American concerns are told that Great Britain desires certified lists of their stockholders, the name, nationality, and address of each and the number of shares of stock owned by each. The corporations are also informed that the British Government desires a list of their clients and to be kept informed of all changes in this list.

Attention is called to the amended act, which authorizes the King, at his discretion, to prohibit by proclamation any British subject from trading with any corporation outside the British dominions which does business with or has associated with it an enemy of Great Britain.

The corporations which have received this request were nearly panic-stricken yesterday. Names of those which have already received it are withheld from publication upon their own request. Their officials stated frankly to reporters for the World that they dared not authorize publication of the communications from their own agents containing Great Britain's "request," because they felt assured that such publication would annoy the British Government and result in their being blacklisted.

TO APPEAL TO LANSING.

Meetings of directors of several of these corporations were held yesterday to discuss the situation and to decide upon some course of action. The result of these meetings, as far as it was possible to learn, was indecisive. Officials of the corporations gave it as their belief that no reply would be made until the question was laid before Secretary of State Lansing and the aid of the State Department sought.

The objection to furnish Great Britain the information, according to statements made by directors, lies chiefly in the fact that the knowledge thus gained by a trade competing nation would, in their opinion, be used to benefit British corporations to the serious handicap of American. It would, in substance, be turning over to rivals the business secrets of American firms, they said.

Charges that Great Britain is throttling this country's hundred million dollar a year copper export trade by using contraband regulations as a pretext to practice gross discrimination in favor of the British merchant were laid before the State Department late in 1914, and again in January of the following year, as the World exclusively told on January 25, 1915.

The five concerns which handle the great bulk of the copper-export trade of the United States combined at that time to engage John Bassett Moore to push their case against Great Britain. This latest demand by Great Britain is regarded as but another step in the throttling campaign, with the "great war" as an excuse.

COPY OF BRITISH ENEMY ACT.

A copy of the amended act has come into the possession of the World. It follows:

"An act to provide for the extension of the restrictions relating to trading with the enemy to persons to whom, though not resident or carrying on business in enemy territory, it is, by reason of their enemy nationality or enemy associations, expedient to extend such restrictions.

"Be it enacted by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

"First. His Majesty may by proclamation prohibit all persons or bodies of persons resident, carrying on business or being in the United Kingdom, from trading with any persons or bodies of persons not resident, or carrying on business in enemy territory or in territory in the occupation of the enemy (other than persons or bodies of persons residing or carrying on business solely within His Majesty's dominions), wherever by reason of the enemy nationality or enemy associations of such persons or bodies of persons it appears to His Majesty expedient to do so, and if any person acts in contravention of any such proclamation he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, triable and punishable in like manner as the offense of trading with the enemy.

"Second. Any list of persons or bodies of persons with whom such trading is prohibited by a proclamation under this act may be varied or added to by an order made by the lords of the council on the recommendation of a secretary of state.

"SCOPE OF THE LAW.

"3. The provisions of the trading with the enemy acts, 1914 and 1915, and all other enactments relating to trading with the enemy shall, subject to such exceptions and adaptations as may be prescribed by order in council, apply in respect of such persons or bodies of persons aforesaid, as if for reference therein to trading with the enemy there were substituted references to trading with such persons and bodies of persons as aforesaid, and for references to enemies there were substituted references to such persons and bodies of persons as aforesaid, and for references to offenses under the trading with the enemy acts, 1914 and 1915, or any of those acts, there were substituted references to offenses under this act.

"4. For the purposes of this act a person or body of persons shall be deemed to have traded with a person or body of persons to whom a proclamation issued under this act applies, if he enters into any transaction or does any act with, to, on behalf of, or for the benefit of such a person or body of persons, which, if entered into or done with, to, on behalf of, or for the benefit of an enemy, would be trading with the enemy.

"Second. This act may be cited as the trading with the enemy (extension of powers) act, 1915."

URGE CONCERTED ACTION.

Officials of American corporations who had received requests for information pointed yesterday to what they considered the great skill with which this act was drawn. Under it, they said, the British Government was free to blacklist any American corporation at its pleasure and without any further explanation than that the corporation had a German, Austrian, Turk, or Bulgarian as a stockholder. There are Germans holding stock in practically every important copper or metal corporation of the United States.

Several said that safety lay only in concerted action by American corporations. They argued that if all American copper corporations would agree to make no reply to the request for information Great Britain would be left without pretext for blacklisting any particular one, and, inasmuch as she must have our copper, the British Government could not prohibit dealing with all.

Despite, apparently, general recognition of this principle, no firm could be found to express its willingness to lead in a movement to bring about such concerted action. Officials explained that the truth was they did not dare do anything which might bring down upon them the wrath of the British Government; that Great Britain had them all in a vise at present, and, as a matter of fact, did about as she pleased in regulating and restricting their export business.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATERWAYS—NOTICE ON CALENDAR.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I notice on the calendar of this morning, under the heading "Unfinished business," a notice given by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] that on the disposal of the unfinished business, the Philippine government bill, he would move to consider Senate bill 3331. That is simply a notice given by an individual Senator; it should not be placed under the heading "Unfinished business," and I ask that in the calendar for to-morrow it shall be changed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any rule of the Senate which provides what shall go on the calendar?

Mr. SMOOT. I have always understood that nothing under the heading of "Unfinished business" should go under that head unless it is unfinished business. This is nothing more nor less than a notice given by a Senator, and, therefore, it should go, the same as other notices, under the heading of "Notices."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator realize that such notices amount to nothing?

Mr. SMOOT. I am fully aware of that. Therefore I did not want to have a notice go under the heading of "Unfinished business."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand that there is any rule of the Senate which fixes what the calendar of business shall contain.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think there is any rule, but it has been the universal practice.

Mr. LODGE. Should not a notice go under the head of "Notices"?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; of course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know how the entry got there.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the notice which was given by the Senator from Tennessee be placed under the heading of "Notices," the same as all other notices in the past have been placed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, it is wholly immaterial to me under what head the notice is placed upon the calendar. The Senator from Utah seems to me to be highly technical. If he desires it in another place, if it affords him any pleasure, I am entirely willing to have it go to another place. I did not ask that it be placed there. However, it seems to me it is in its proper place, as it relates to unfinished business. It does not purport to be unfinished business, but relates to what will be asked to be made the unfinished business. But, as I said, it is immaterial to me whether it goes under that heading or under the heading of an ordinary notice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, on all further prints of the Calendar of Business of the Senate the notice of the Senator from Tennessee will go under the head of "Notices."

TAX ON MINING PROPERTY IN MEXICO.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have a communication from one of my constituents relating to the decree of Carranza affecting mining property in Mexico owned by Americans, tending to show that the enforcement of the taxes levied by this decree will amount to a confiscation of property. I ask to have the communication printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 6, 1916.

MY DEAR SENATOR WORKS: I wrote the inclosures last night and this morning am surprised to see in the Los Angeles Times an article regarding the very selfsame outrage—the Carranza mining decree—a copy of the article I shall give below. Also we note with interest another article in same issue—one advising us of the manly attitude taken by yourself in a speech in the Senate, explaining to them most thoroughly that our so-called neutrality of to-day is but one of hypocrisy. I assure you that you are receiving the hearty sanction of almost the entire populace. Would that there were more like you where you are, who would be fearless enough to come out of the dark and talk as they surely really down in their hearts believe.

The notice first spoken of is as follows:

"CARRANZA INSISTS ON MINING TAX—DECLARES STEPS NECESSARY TO PREVENT MONOPOLIES.

"EL PASO, TEX., January 5.

"Negotiations of representatives of the International Mining Association with Mexican de facto government officials for annulment of the decree of March 1, 1915, which places income taxes on mines and their output, have been without result, according to advices from Mexico City to-day.

"The mining men contend that the decree taxes are prohibitive and claim that nearly all of the 440,000 mining claims in Mexico will be compelled to discontinue operation under their terms.

"Gen. Carranza, according to reports, contends the decree, by fixing a graduated tax on holdings of more than 10 claims (each claim is but 2½ acres), tends to discourage monopolies and is similar to the income tax in the United States."

The above dispatch only helps to authenticate the necessity of our Government taking this matter up and demanding that our rights be not sacrificed. It also shows that influence of others than the mining men themselves must be solicited and obtained or these 400,000 mining claims will be confiscated for such taxes, as are fully explained in the inclosures as certainly confiscatory.

The inclosures also show plainly the hypocrisy and incompetency of the statement above as quoted as the reason for the decree being insisted upon.

Trusting you can make use of all this, I am,

Respectfully,

E. J. KIMBALL.

P. S.—I shall to-day endeavor to get the chamber of commerce or mines to take this matter up also.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., January 5, 1916.

Hon. Senator JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Firstly I wish to again thank you for your favors in the past which have been of invaluable service to me in obtaining action on the part of our Department of State as to Mexican affairs. I am inclosing data on a serious condition that has arisen in the matter of the decrees of the newly recognized President of Mexico. Another self-made President.

Certainly this confiscatory decree, as explained in the inclosed article, can be eliminated if our President and Senate, or either or both, will force the issue and protect us against a pure confiscatory measure made under the guise of a tax. No doubt it is a concocted scheme on the part of some one or ones to make a wholesale killing in the con-

fiscation of properties in that land of Manana. It should be pinched in the bud. I wish you would find time and opportunity to look into this matter, if possible, along with any other Senators who will be so kind as to do so.

I shall send copies of the inclosure, with comments, to several other Republican Senators within the next few days.

Thanking you in the matter, I am sincerely,

E. J. KIMBALL,
1632½ Winona Boulevard, Hollywood,
Los Angeles, Cal.

AS TO THE DECREE OF VENUSTIANO CARRANZA, PROVISIONAL PRESIDENT OF MEXICO, AFFECTING MINING TAXES ON PROPERTIES IN MEXICO, PAYABLE DURING MARCH, 1916, AND THEREAFTER.

All persons owning mining properties in Mexico or being in any manner interested in the future and welfare of Mexico should take notice of the following and use their good influence to endeavor to show the Mexican authorities that for the welfare of Mexico and for the sake of equity and justice to foreigners owning properties in that country that the decree in mention and explained below should be rescinded at once.

It is in name a tax, but in purpose and effect is none other than a diplomatic confiscatory measure. Surely confiscating the greater portion of the mining claims belonging to Americans and other foreigners in Mexico. With the exception perhaps of those properties belonging to a few great corporations, who may be fortunate through governmental pressure or private arrangement to escape this tax.

Mining properties owned by Americans and other foreigners in Mexico were either purchased or located by them during the régimes of Porfirio Díaz, Ego Madero, or Victoriana Huerta, and at a time when the taxes, although high enough, were not confiscatory. The taxes were as follows:

For the first 25 pertenencias in a claim, tax was yearly 6 pesos each. For all pertenencias in addition to 25, tax was yearly 3 pesos each. Therefore, if a claim contains 60 pertenencias, the tax was as follows:

First 25 pertenencias, at 6 pesos yearly, or 150 pesos.	
The remaining 35 pertenencias, at 3 pesos, or 105 pesos.	
Thus for a mine of 60 pertenencias the tax was 255 pesos yearly.	
Under the Carranza decree the mining tax is as follows, no matter whether your holdings are in one claim or in many:	
The first 10 pertenencias in a district, tax 12 pesos, gold, yearly each pertenencia.	
The second 10 pertenencias in a district, tax 15 pesos, gold, yearly each pertenencia.	
From 20 to 50 pertenencias in a district, tax 18 pesos, gold, yearly each pertenencia.	
For every pertenencia above 50 in a district, tax 24 pesos, gold, yearly each pertenencia.	
Therefore, second to the new decree, the tax on the same claims as cited above as being 255 pesos yearly will be henceforth as follows:	

	Pesos gold.
First 10 pertenencias, at 12 pesos gold yearly, or.....	120
Second 10 pertenencias, at 15 pesos gold yearly, or.....	150
Next 30 pertenencias, at 18 pesos gold yearly, or.....	540
Remaining 10 pertenencias, at 24 pesos gold yearly, or.....	240
	1,050

Thus, the tax on 60 pertenencias has been raised from 255 pesos to 1,050 pesos yearly. If the case were that a company has 500 pertenencias in a district—which is a common occurrence, and many times much more—the difference in the amounts as paid when they obtained such holdings and what they will be compelled to pay henceforth or loose their claims is as follows:

	OLD LAW.	Pesos.
First 25 pertenencias, at 6 pesos each yearly, or.....		150
Remaining 475 pertenencias, at 3 pesos each yearly, or.....		1,425
Total tax yearly.....		1,575

Under new decree, the yearly tax on 500 pertenencias is as follows:

	Pesos gold.
First 10 pertenencias, at 12 pesos each yearly, or.....	120
Second 10 pertenencias, at 15 pesos each yearly, or.....	150
20 to 50 pertenencias, at 18 pesos each yearly, or.....	540
Remaining 450 pertenencias, at 24 pesos each yearly, or.....	10,800
Tax yearly on 500 pertenencias.....	11,610

One thousand and fifty pesos instead of 255 pesos yearly on 60 pertenencias.

Eleven thousand six hundred and ten pesos gold tax instead of 1,574 pesos on 500 pertenencias.

Besides this so-called tax increase, there is accompanying it an exceedingly great increase in the tax on all production of the metals—

A gross tax of 110 gold on every kilo of gold produced.

A gross tax of 2.60 pesos gold on every kilo of silver produced.

Under certain circumstances this production tax is reduced 20 per cent, making it close to and around 7 per cent of the gold and silver produced.

It is needless to say that there are very few mines anywhere that will, month after month and year in and year out, pay a profit outside of all expenses of as much as 7 per cent gross of the production. Therefore it is plain to anyone that this tax is not a tax at all, but simply a diplomatic method of the confiscation of the greater portion of the mines of Mexico from their rightful owners, who have in good faith either purchased or located their properties, as the individual case may be.

When the revolutions broke out in Mexico these mine owners were rapidly developing the resources of Mexico.

American mine owners were ordered by their respective consular agents of the United States of America to leave Mexico and return to the United States of America and were advised that their properties would be protected.

These Americans closed down their mines as ordered, or their development enterprises, as the case might have been.

Now they are being "protected" by the administration that ordered them to leave Mexico. Protected! Better said they are sanctioning the Americans and other foreigners being diplomatically robbed of their holdings.

Should they not have the privilege of returning to Mexico when peace does reign and without any danger of confiscation at all be allowed to develop their properties, paying an equitable tax and having ample protection?

If proper representations be made, no doubt the Mexican authorities could be persuaded to see the unjust position taken in this matter by them. What an injustice it is and also what a disaster it will mean to Mexico herself to enforce such decrees, for it will surely keep nearly all foreign capital from their country. It will be needless to say, thus also cause very little American machinery and American products to go into that land—a greater injustice to Mexico herself than to anyone else. This is not only of importance to mining men but to everyone, for the throttling of the mining interests in Mexico would be far-reaching, indeed.

If this decree is not rescinded, Mexico's mining interests will have been throttled, the properties of the majority of the Americans will have been confiscated. These Americans and other foreigners' interests will have been sacrificed on the altar of greed and dishonesty, at least acquiesced in and presided over by that man who guarantees the safe delivery of death-dealing munitions of war to his favored friends, placing innocent women and babes astride torpedoes to guarantee or insure them against molestation of destruction even by those whom they are being sent to kill.

ENLISTMENT OF AMERICAN CITIZENS IN CANADA.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, it appears that some time ago the Secretary of Labor issued a statement in the form of a rule that a citizen of the United States enlisting in the Canadian Army to fight in Europe could, upon his return to the United States, be admitted to full citizenship. I do not care to discuss that proposition now, but inasmuch as the article which I ask to have read contains a procedure of enlistment and the oath which the soldier takes, I desire a clipping from a Michigan paper, an editorial, about a third of a column, to be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

ENLISTMENT AND CITIZENSHIP.

There has been some protest from German sympathizers in this country because Secretary Wilson, of the Department of Labor, has ruled that Americans who enlist in the Canadian Army and subsequently return to this country are not to be treated as aliens by the immigration inspectors, but are to be allowed full rights as citizens of the United States. The pro-Germans insist that such persons lose their citizenship by entering the service of a foreign potentate. Wilson bases his ruling on the circumstance that the United States accepts the enlistment of aliens without depriving them of their citizenship in the land of their birth.

Without in the least undertaking to take sides in this controversy, we venture to suggest that what Canada requires in accepting the services of aliens is more pertinent just now than what the United States does, since it is Canada and not America that is swearing in troops.

The Canadian enlistment blanks for those desiring to join the overseas expeditionary force contain a declaration and an oath which must be signed by the applicant. In the declaration the recruit says he engages and agrees to serve in the over-seas force and to be attached to any arm of its service for one year, or during the war now going on between Great Britain and Germany should that war continue more than a year, and also for six months after the termination of the war "provided His Majesty should so long require my services."

The oath says:

"I do make oath that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King George V, his heirs and successors, and that I will, as duty bound, honestly and faithfully defend His Majesty, his heirs and successors in person, crown, and dignity against all enemies, and will observe and obey all orders of His Majesty, his heirs and successors, and all the generals and officers set over me."

The Canadian recruiting officers hold that the declaration explains and modifies the oath, and shows that the American recruit is entering into only a temporary engagement and allegiance.

When an alien acquires citizenship in this country he is required to forswear and repudiate all foreign allegiance. Can he subsequently reassume that allegiance and then drop it again at pleasure, as one might take on or put off a cloak, and still remain an American citizen? Can a native-born American give temporary fealty to a foreign monarch and retain his rights in this country unimpaired? Can there be such a thing as a partial allegiance to a foreign government on the part of an American which will not affect his standing as a citizen of the United States?

Such things may be possible. But the final determination must be left to an expert. Even Secretary Wilson recognizes this, for he admits that his ruling is only provisional until the courts have opportunity to pass on the subject.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the ruling of the Secretary of Labor at this time further than to say that it seems to me most remarkable that a citizen of the United States can take such an oath, which might possibly easily involve him against his own country in defense of a foreign potentate; but inasmuch as the matter is not now here I am going to refrain from submitting any remarks at this time, but shall only submit to the Senate the statement which I have had read.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have here a communication from the Secretary of Labor on the subject to which the Senator from Michigan has just now referred, which sets out in detail the Secretary's view of the matter. It is important that the Senate should have information concerning the subject, because it is a question of no mean importance. I think that it ought to be printed in the Record without reading.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I shall be very glad to have that done.

Mr. WALSH. I will say in this connection that I have been appealed to in a very considerable number of cases by the parents of boys 16, 17, and 18 years of age, who have been induced to enlist in the military service of Great Britain, to secure, if possible, their release. I do not care to comment at this time upon efforts that are being made to thus lead our young men into the service of any of the contending nations. I submit, however, that it would be a somewhat regrettable thing if these boys by their heedless and inconsiderable action should be put in a situation where they could no longer claim the protection of our Government nor claim the advantages of American citizenship when they should be restored to their parents. I do not mean to say that it would not be wise that that conclusion should follow, but the question is a rather delicate one. Therefore I am glad to submit what the Secretary of Labor has to say about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the communication submitted by the Senator from Montana will be printed in the Record.

The communication referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 8, 1916.

Hon. T. J. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter addressed to the solicitor for the department, in which you inclose an article from the *Fatherland* criticizing the action of this department in the case of Frank Caswell, wherein the department laid down a rule of policy, hereinafter referred to, in this class of cases. The article quotes a circular issued by the commissioner of immigration at Montreal, Canada, as follows:

"Several cases have arisen of late wherein the question has been raised as to whether a United States citizen expatriates himself by enlisting in the Canadian Army. The matter has been the subject of considerable correspondence and has now been definitely decided, as attested by the following quotation from bureau letter of October 9, 1915, No. 54003431:

"Instructions should be issued by you to the end that hereafter the boards will not question the American citizenship of an applicant because of the fact that he took the oath of allegiance and enlisted in the Canadian forces."

"Officers in this district will be governed accordingly."

The article then states:

"Under this ruling a native-born or naturalized American citizen may take a solemn oath that he will forever forswear allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, become a subject of King George of England, offer his life and limbs in the cause of a foreign potentate, and yet remain a citizen of the United States, welcome to return and be received into full citizenship as anyone else who has throughout remained loyal to his own country."

Of course there is no truth in the statement that "under this ruling a native-born or naturalized American citizen may take a solemn oath that he will forever forswear allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, become a subject of King George of England, * * * and yet remain a citizen of the United States." The Department of Labor and the Bureau of Immigration have invariably administered the immigration laws impartially, irrespective of the nationality of the applicant for admission. It is probable that a number of men of American birth have enlisted in the armies of each of the belligerent countries of Europe and have taken the qualified oath of allegiance which a soldier is required to take upon enlistment, and the same interpretation of the law would naturally be applied to each of them when returning to the United States as was applied in the case which resulted in the issuance of the circular quoted in the clipping, no matter which of the armies they enlisted in. The circular was issued by the commissioner of immigration at Montreal to the immigration inspectors on the Canadian border as per the decision of the department in the Frank Caswell case contained in the following letter of instructions from the Acting Commissioner General:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 9, 1915.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION,
Montreal, Canada:

Referring to the Frank Caswell case (your 11035/395), you are advised that the board should reconsider his application for admission without relation to the fact that he enlisted in the expeditionary force from Canada to Great Britain.

Instructions should be issued by you to the end that hereafter the boards will not question the American citizenship of an applicant because of the fact he took the oath of allegiance and enlisted in the Canadian forces.

ALFRED HAMPTON,
Assistant Commissioner General.

You will observe that the circular only quotes a portion of the bureau letter, and consequently does not show the fact that the conclusions arrived at grew out of the consideration of a specific case, nor does the letter make any reference to the moot point of law upon which the department based its action. The letter of the Acting Commissioner General represents, in part, the attitude of this department in dealing with the subject of expatriation in administering the immigration laws, except that the word "qualified," which should have occurred before the word "oath," was inadvertently omitted in the communication.

This department has no authority to determine the question of expatriation except for the purpose of administering the immigration and Chinese exclusion laws. It can not confer citizenship upon anyone. That is a judicial function. An alien coming to the United States is admitted solely as a matter of privilege if he conforms to certain conditions established by law. An American citizen returning to the United States is entitled to admission unconditionally as a matter of right. If we err in denying admission to an alien, his only ground of complaint is that he has been denied the privilege which has been

granted to others similarly situated. If we err in denying admission to a citizen, the department is placed in the position of taking away from one of our own people that which is his inherent right.

In the act of March 2, 1907, section 2 (34 Stat., 1228), Congress, for the first time, undertook to define the conditions which would result in expatriation. It provided:

"That any American citizen shall be deemed to have expatriated himself when he has been naturalized in any foreign State in conformity with its laws or when he has taken an oath of allegiance to any foreign State.

"When any naturalized citizen shall have resided for two years in the foreign State from which he came, or for five years in any other foreign State, it shall be presumed that he has ceased to be an American citizen, and the place of his general abode shall be deemed his place of residence during said years: *Provided, however*, That such presumption may be overcome on the presentation of satisfactory evidence to a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, under such rules and regulations as the Department of State may prescribe: *And provided also*, That no American citizen shall be allowed to expatriate himself when this country is at war."

In construing this law for the purpose of administering the immigration laws it is the policy of this department that whenever any citizen of the United States, native or naturalized, takes an unqualified oath of allegiance to any foreign State by which he becomes a citizen or subject of that State, or renounces his allegiance to the United States, or when any naturalized citizen shall have resided for two years in the foreign State from whence he came, or for five years in any other foreign State, without having presented satisfactory evidence to a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, under such rules and regulations as the Department of State shall prescribe, to presume that the expatriation is complete, and such persons presenting themselves for admission to the United States are dealt with in exactly the same manner as any other alien.

When any citizen of the United States takes a limited or qualified oath of allegiance to a foreign State, which expires by its own time limitations and does not make him a subject or citizen of the foreign State to which he has sworn allegiance, and which does not renounce allegiance to the United States, a judicial question is involved which, so far as this department is advised, has never been determined by any of our courts, as to whether or not citizenship in the United States is automatically restored when the time limit of the oath of allegiance to a foreign State has expired and the person who has taken such an oath seeks to return to this country. It is understood that the oaths of allegiance taken by citizens of the United States when they join the army of any of the belligerents in the war now raging in Europe do not make them citizens or subjects of the State whose army they join. They expire by virtue of their own time limitations, and contain no clause renouncing allegiance to the United States. These conditions create an element of doubt concerning the automatic restoration of citizenship to persons who have taken such an oath, and until the question has been determined by judicial interpretation it is the purpose of this department in administering the immigration laws to resolve the doubt in favor of the person returning to the United States under these circumstances.

I would be very glad to arrange with the Department of Justice to have a test case instituted which would determine the point at issue. That can be very readily accomplished in the Frank Caswell case, out of which have grown the rulings of this department on the question. Frank Caswell, a native of Maine, went to Canada in 1912 for the purpose of obtaining employment. During his stay there, on August 13, 1914, he enlisted in the Canadian military service and was sent to England for the purpose of training. He returned to Canada on April 3, 1915, and was discharged from the military service in question on the 7th of April following. It appears that he took the regular oath of allegiance required of all persons enlisting in the Canadian service for the present European war. On August 18 last he secured an offer of employment from a cabinet company in Detroit, Mich., and while on his way to accept the same he was excluded at Port Huron, Mich., as an alien seeking to enter the United States in violation of the contract-labor provisions of the act of February 20, 1907 (34 Stat., 898), his alienage being based on the ground that the oath of allegiance taken when he entered the Canadian military service operated to expatriate him, under the provisions of section 3 of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat., 1228), which made him, as an alien, amenable to the provisions of the immigration law. Upon appeal to the department he was admitted, in accordance with the policy outlined above. He is now in the United States. The essential facts are admitted. If he is an alien, he has violated the alien contract-labor provisions of the immigration laws, is unlawfully in the United States, and can be deported. Deportation proceedings can readily be instituted and an interpretation obtained from the courts which can be used as a guide in the administration of the law.

Respectfully,

W. B. WILSON, *Secretary*.

FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC STEEL.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, recently in this body a statement was made that two-thirds of the structural steel which was used in the reconstruction of San Francisco, Cal., was imported from Europe. For the information of the Senate I wrote to the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco and to the iron works there. I have a communication in reply, and I request that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the communication presented by the Senator from California will be printed in the RECORD.

The communication referred to is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, December 31, 1915.

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your inquiry concerning the use of German steel in the reconstruction work in San Francisco, Cal., we beg to submit the following, gleaned from our knowledge of the facts and figures:

Since the disaster of 1906, approximately 1,100,000 tons of structural steel has been used in rebuilding, of which at the utmost 120,000 tons was imported direct to this port from Germany and Belgium.

Of the total tonnage of 1,100,000 tons used, approximately 600,000 tons was fabricated and erected by the local shops, and the balance, 500,000 tons, was furnished and erected by eastern firms.

We have no means of ascertaining whether any of the steel used by the eastern firms was imported from abroad or not, but the amount of foreign steel brought direct to this port by the local shops and used in reconstruction is less than 12 per cent of the total tonnage used.

The comparative prices of foreign and domestic steel at various periods from 1906 to the present are as follows:

10 years.	Domestic price.	Foreign price at San Francisco, Cal.
	Per cent.	Per cent.
1906	\$2.35 to \$2.50	\$2.30
1907	2.25 to 2.45	2.25
1908	2.35 to 2.40	2.20
1909	2.10 to 2.25	1.85
1910	2.10 to 2.20	1.85
1911	2.05 to 2.25	1.82
1912	1.90 to 2.20	\$1.90 to 2.02
1913	2.25	1.76
1914	1.90	1.34 to 1.76
1915	1.90 to 2.65	(¹)

¹ No information at San Francisco for first half of year.

Trusting that the foregoing will serve your purpose, and that if we can be of any further assistance to you that you will not hesitate to command us, we beg to remain,

Respectfully, yours,

CENTRAL IRON WORKS (INC.),
A. A. DEVOTO, *President*.

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED TO MR. PHELAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, December 24, 1915.

Referring to the amount of structural steel which came into this port during the reconstruction period, I beg to advise you that it is extremely difficult to determine, owing to the changing classifications of the customhouse. By carefully checking the records of the customhouse from 1906 to the present time and by comparison with the figures similarly obtained by one of the largest steel users in the West, we can roughly estimate the amount of purely structural steel imported into San Francisco during this period to be 33,000 tons.

There is no doubt that much bar iron came in, which was used for reinforcing purposes, but it is nearly impossible to approximate this amount, as it is included within the figures under the classification ingot, bar, and other steel. We are informed by steel men familiar with the situation that the steel imported into this port for this purpose was approximately 10 per cent of the amount used.

Very truly, yours,

SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By ROBERT K. LYNCH,
Vice President and Manager.

THE EXPORT TRADE.

Mr. STONE. During the month of November last I addressed a communication to the Secretary of Commerce, requesting him to furnish me with some statistical information. I sought to ascertain, as far as possible, the data showing the amount of our exports to various countries, those engaged in war and neutral countries, and also, as far as possible, to separate such exports, so as to show what part of those exports could be said to be for war purposes as compared with exports that could not be said to be for war uses. I have here an answer to my communication.

The Secretary of Commerce has transmitted to me a communication from the Bureau of Statistics inclosing two tables. The first of these tables shows the values of exports from the United States to the principal foreign countries in October, 1913, and October, 1915, with the increase or decrease to each country. The European countries are grouped in two classes according as they are belligerent or neutral.

The second of these tables shows the exports of domestic merchandise from the United States to belligerent countries of Europe, Canada, Japan, and Asiatic Russia, to the neutral countries of Europe, and to other countries in October, 1913, and October, 1915, classified according to the extent of their use as munitions of war.

I thought that the communication and the tables would be of interest and value to Senators, and I therefore ask that they may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DECEMBER 27, 1915.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE:

There are inclosed herewith two tables showing:

1. The value of exports from the United States to the principal foreign countries in October, 1913, and October, 1915, with increase or decrease to each country. The European countries are grouped in two classes according as they are belligerent or neutral.

2. The exports of domestic merchandise from the United States to belligerent countries of Europe, to Canada, Japan, and Asiatic Russia, to neutral countries of Europe, and to other countries in October, 1913, and October, 1915, classified according to extent of use as munitions of war.

A single month has been taken, because of the difficulty in making the necessary compilation from the returns of the various collectors of customs. Similar returns can be compiled, if necessary, for later months and, it is believed, much more promptly. October is doubtless the best single month, because of the heavy shipments. Comparison is made with October, 1913, the latest corresponding month before the outbreak of war.

There have been large shipments to Canada, doubtless intended, in part, for reexportation to Europe, and to Asiatic Russia for shipment across Siberia. Exports to these countries and to Japan are shown so as to avoid any suspicion that the movement of war supplies has been minimized. In view of the very close supervision of the trade with neutral countries it is considered doubtful whether any considerable exports to such countries can reach belligerent destinations.

The impossibility of distinguishing accurately between munitions of war and commercial shipments must be clearly recognized. It is not practicable to ask our exporters to declare whether each individual shipment is destined for the supply of armies or for commercial use. Many shippers are undoubtedly not informed and, in any event, such a requirement would meet vigorous opposition. Yet in no other way can commercial shipments and army shipments be distinguished, even in a general way. With the leading competing nations at war, it is natural that there should be large demands for our manufactures from neutral countries and from belligerents themselves for goods which were formerly obtained from the manufacturing nations of Europe. Failure to give due weight to this consideration is responsible for much of the confusion that has appeared in newspaper interviews. The increased exports to the nations at war are frequently taken as a measure of our trade in army supplies while, to a large extent, these exports are the result of lessened productivity in the warring nations.

EXPORTS TO BELLIGERENT EUROPE.

To the belligerent countries of Europe our total exports in October, 1915, were \$31,500,000 more than our exports two years earlier. Explosives and firearms showed a gain of \$18,000,000. Articles largely used for army purposes, including horses, woolen wearing apparel, commercial automobiles, etc., increased \$21,000,000. Foodstuffs, the proportion of which used for army supplies can not be determined, increased \$26,000,000, and other articles partly used for army supplies increased \$21,000,000.

Some of these increases can not fairly be chargeable to the war. Our wheat crop this year is 249,000,000 bushels more than in 1913, an increase of 32 per cent, which would undoubtedly, even had peace prevailed, have resulted in largely increased shipments. To credit one-half of the gain in the third group of articles (those partly used for army supplies) would perhaps be fair, and on this basis \$60,000,000 to \$65,000,000 would represent the amount of munitions of war in our October exports.

Even counting the total gain in the articles used partly for army supplies, the increased exports in all three classes amounted to somewhat less than \$86,000,000. This maximum commercial gain from the war must be offset by our loss in cotton and copper.

The cotton crop last year was 2,000,000 bales more than the year before (a percentage gain of 14 per cent). The small crop of the present year, largely due to reduced acreage, reflecting the low prices of last year, is supplemented by heavy stocks. The decrease of \$63,000,000 in our cotton exports to belligerent countries is therefore attributable directly to the war. Copper exports fell off a third in value, while the production in 1914 was only 6 per cent less than the year before.

Charging off the large decrease in cotton and copper and the smaller decrease in gasoline and naphtha, the net gain from the war, even on the most liberal basis of calculation, is only \$19,500,000 (for October). In articles which can scarcely be affected appreciably by the war, the gain in exports to belligerent countries was \$12,000,000. This group includes a \$600,000 increase in coal and coke, a \$700,000 increase in wire (other than barbed wire) and wire manufactures, a gain of \$300,000 in cottonseed oil, and of \$160,000 in tinplate. Barley, corn, cars and carriages, tanning bark, dyes and dyestuffs, sugar machinery, leather manufactures (other than men's boots and shoes and harness and saddles), oleo oil, butter, condensed milk, gas oil and fuel oil, toys, beans, peas, and potatoes are some of the other articles showing a gain to all countries of more than \$100,000 each.

EXPORTS TO CANADA, JAPAN, AND ASIATIC RUSSIA.

The only largely increased exports to Canada of articles in Table 2 are horses, with a gain of \$3,000,000, and brass, with a gain of \$1,500,000. To Asiatic Russia the gains are chiefly \$2,500,000 in locomotives and \$1,000,000 in steel rails. To Japan, although a country at war, the exports show a decrease, chiefly in raw cotton (\$2,400,000).

EXPORTS TO NEUTRAL EUROPE.

Our exports to neutral Europe doubled. The gain of \$16,600,000 is made up chiefly of wheat, \$5,000,000; rye, \$3,000,000; bacon, \$1,000,000; and sole and upper leather, \$800,000. Our abundant wheat crop and the

cutting off of the Russian supply of rye explain fully the largest two items. From the nature of the articles involved our gain, if any, from the war, is due to the temporary elimination of our foreign competitors.

GAINS AND LOSSES TO INDIVIDUAL COMPANIES.

Largely increased exports to the United Kingdom, Italy, European Russia, and France are offset in part by the cutting off of our shipments to Germany, Belgium, and Austria-Hungary.

It is to the neutral countries of Europe that increased exports are most general. This is natural, in view of the former dependence of these countries on supplies from the countries at war and the need of finding new sources to meet their requirements. Gains are largest in exports to Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands, and Greece. Only Roumania, to which approach through both central Europe and Turkey has been closed, shows a loss.

Among non-European countries, our gains are largest to Asiatic Russia and Cuba and our loss greatest to Japan. This disastrous effects of the war on the markets of South American are, in spite of recent improvement, visible in exports to Brazil, Chile, and Argentina much below the level of two years ago. For the preceding quarter (July-September) the showing to Argentina, Brazil, and Chile was more favorable, a gain of \$5,000,000 over the corresponding three months of 1913 being recorded.

FRANK R. RUTTER,
Assistant Chief of Bureau.

The value of exports from the United States to principal foreign countries in October, 1913, and October, 1915.

Countries.	1915	1913	Increase.	Decrease.
Belligerent Europe:				
Austria-Hungary.....	\$1,024	\$2,283,009		\$2,281,985
Belgium.....	1,685,358	6,266,678		4,581,320
Bulgaria.....	40,731	17,073	\$23,658	
Finland.....	45,939	391,116		345,177
France.....	31,986,091	25,935,813	6,050,278	
Germany.....	2,500	48,139,400		48,136,900
Gibraltar.....	361,752	109,565	252,187	
Italy.....	38,305,420	7,422,912	30,882,508	
Malta, Gozo, etc.....	210,412	57,396	153,016	
Russia in Europe.....	11,258,429	2,350,091	8,908,338	
Servia and Montenegro.....	162,567		162,567	
Turkey in Europe.....		112,504		112,504
United Kingdom—				
England.....	101,625,949	67,094,152	34,531,797	
Scotland.....	4,210,224	2,629,005	1,581,219	
Ireland.....	5,356,610	947,913	4,408,697	
Total.....	195,253,006	163,756,627	31,496,379	
Neutral Europe:				
Azores and Madeira Islands.....	150,125	27,191	122,934	
Denmark.....	3,772,141	2,143,825	1,628,316	
Greece.....	2,481,369	50,483	2,430,881	
Iceland and Faroe Islands.....	79,288	512	78,776	
Netherlands.....	9,901,932	6,901,433	3,000,549	
Norway.....	4,570,051	848,314	3,721,737	
Portugal.....	1,406,159	892,047	514,112	
Roumania.....	12,027	72,243		60,216
Spain.....	5,028,498	3,734,350	1,294,148	
Sweden.....	5,428,776	1,932,108	3,496,668	
Switzerland.....	467,064	54,673	412,391	
Total.....	33,297,480	16,657,184	16,640,296	
Canada.....	33,674,850	31,920,548	1,754,302	
Cuba.....	9,658,001	6,826,173	2,831,828	
Argentina.....	4,791,402	5,160,715		369,313
Brazil.....	2,597,518	3,863,301		1,265,783
Chile.....	1,827,315	2,219,936		392,621
British India.....	1,089,248	1,527,560		438,312
Japan.....	4,315,689	7,783,168		3,467,479
Russia in Asia.....	7,005,241	54,182	6,951,059	
Australia.....	4,027,235	4,808,795		781,560
New Zealand.....	1,046,985	1,165,373		118,388
Philippine Islands.....	1,777,547	3,001,971		1,224,424
British South Africa.....	2,271,107	1,186,151	1,084,956	
Other countries.....	19,181,417	19,074,750	106,667	
Total.....	93,263,555	88,589,623	4,673,932	
Total exports.....	321,814,041	269,003,434	52,810,607	

Exports of domestic merchandise from the United States to belligerent countries of Europe, to Canada, Japan, and Asiatic Russia, to neutral countries of Europe, and to other countries, October, 1913, and October, 1915, classified according to extent of use as munitions of war.

Articles.	Belligerent Europe.		Canada, Japan, and Asiatic Russia.		Neutral Europe.		Other countries.		Total.	
	1915	1913	1915	1913	1915	1913	1915	1913	1915	1913
Firearms and ammunition:										
Explosives (except dynamite).....	\$17,951,376	\$7,402	\$640,351	\$28,478	\$17,430	\$1,521	\$469,010	\$350,928	\$19,078,167	\$388,329
Firearms.....	345,499	44,643	23,795	52,675	55,832	2,468	131,614	256,343	556,740	356,129
Total.....	18,296,875	52,045	664,146	81,153	73,262	3,989	600,624	607,271	19,634,907	744,458
Articles largely used for army purposes:										
Horses.....	5,417,850	84,700	3,404,745	220,436			23,357	26,264	8,845,952	331,400
Wool wearing apparel.....	4,251,522	13,013	137,973	143,030	92	320	52,338	41,712	4,441,925	198,075
Commercial automobiles.....	4,058,199	5,809	174,391	51,656	49,307	6,091	25,293	65,950	4,307,190	129,506
Wool, manufacturers of (except rags).....	1,973,787	27,294	234,116	44,450	14,491	201	129,114	19,565	2,351,508	91,510
Mules.....	1,779,140		3,200	4,225			41,897	78,673	1,824,237	82,898
Harness and saddles.....	944,847	3,797	5,038	12,787	1,220	115	33,987	49,153	985,092	65,852
Wire, barbed.....	870,002	3,502	101,675	95,029		606	228,895	302,436	1,260,572	401,564
Lead, manufactures of.....	755,870	8,843	281,154	20,613	89,287	498	118,973	63,823	1,245,284	93,807
Boots and shoes (men's).....	671,540	340,706	28,672	81,647	11,978	13,016	720,223	588,813	1,432,413	1,024,182

Exports of domestic merchandise from the United States to belligerent countries of Europe, to Canada, Japan, and Asiatic Russia, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Belligerent Europe.		Canada, Japan, and Asiatic Russia.		Neutral Europe.		Other countries.		Total.	
	1915	1913	1915	1913	1915	1913	1915	1913	1915	1913
Articles largely used for army purposes—Con.										
Aeroplanes, and parts of.....	\$382,782	\$344	\$55,739	\$157	\$125	\$372	\$389	\$438,893	\$1,015
Hay.....	162,996	440	7,124	36,000	655	36,370	29,722	206,490	66,817
Surgical appliances.....	132,119	34,920	41,868	31,259	852	118,696	38,259	292,653	105,290
Horseshoes.....	59,680	1,216	785	4,147	5,278	65,043	6,063
Total.....	21,460,334	523,368	4,476,911	742,095	\$169,375	22,479	1,533,632	1,310,037	27,637,252	2,597,979
Articles partly used for army supplies showing material increase in exports to belligerent countries:										
Foodstuffs—										
Wheat.....	12,567,813	4,731,373	256,777	755,703	6,300,228	1,215,252	1,388,694	66,895	20,513,418	6,769,223
Sugar, refined.....	8,428,692	17,772	1,285	2,866	124,805	3,881	586,848	231,106	9,141,630	255,625
Bacon.....	4,892,580	1,810,538	156,757	170,284	1,765,229	199,389	164,188	170,788	6,978,754	2,380,999
Cats.....	2,630,622	61	115,562	1,151	470,199	68,573	13,903	3,284,956	15,115
Hams and shoulders.....	2,539,508	1,583,052	19,151	81,410	2,398	11,346	207,743	177,506	2,768,800	1,833,314
Salmon, canned.....	2,325,444	1,516,308	129,171	40,821	4,736	700	416,965	283,538	2,876,316	1,841,367
Wheat flour.....	2,118,451	1,815,047	84,891	500,422	957,843	774,942	3,804,109	2,656,214	6,965,294	5,746,625
Beef, fresh.....	1,310,780	162	1,711	34,378	35,344	1,345,320	37,055
Beef, canned.....	447,057	7,429	821	3,443	756	15,760	36,897	463,638	48,495
Rye.....	106,000	113	8,106	3,101,817	11	3,207,941	8,106
Total foodstuffs.....	37,366,947	11,511,580	764,686	1,565,917	12,727,255	2,206,266	6,687,179	3,672,161	57,546,067	18,955,924
Brass, and manufactures of.....	4,188,655	253,185	1,851,129	259,539	291,392	9,794	132,356	73,593	6,463,532	596,111
Leather, sole and upper.....	3,685,756	1,947,920	212,740	93,210	1,111,753	283,354	507,538	389,024	5,517,787	2,713,508
Zinc, manufactures of.....	2,789,499	1,456	286,011	6,533	2,644	278	303,684	5,277	3,381,838	13,544
Metal-working machinery.....	2,688,087	913,906	396,580	111,985	107,670	89,754	43,942	302,932	3,236,079	1,418,577
All other chemicals not specified.....	2,358,731	62,508	767,597	301,546	156,174	11,071	587,361	411,021	3,869,863	788,146
India rubber, manufactures of.....	2,048,138	391,901	327,416	322,947	36,894	40,494	816,287	409,187	3,228,735	1,164,526
Passenger automobiles.....	1,410,852	375,222	187,477	384,206	70,312	37,446	1,080,614	866,842	2,749,255	1,663,719
Cotton wearing apparel (except corsets).....	1,038,306	84,109	183,698	189,954	22,841	11,095	886,315	356,982	2,131,160	642,140
Steel bars and billets, etc.....	1,933,159	43,535	845,139	431,496	5,206	1,425	391,790	275,240	3,175,294	751,696
Automobiles, parts of.....	1,062,485	436,596	624,185	186,406	19,147	2,702	174,133	102,796	1,819,950	728,470
Zinc pigs, bars, etc.....	712,686	40,058	11,331	431	752,744	11,762
Acids.....	597,129	3,312	28,889	9,079	2,944	265	273,018	27,896	901,980	40,552
Gasoline engines.....	482,820	245,891	381,306	170,817	10,027	23,833	110,576	185,706	984,729	623,247
Steel rails.....	238,899	4,921	1,194,541	416,042	108,636	28,550	643,504	809,262	2,185,580	1,258,775
Iron and steel sheets and plates.....	226,762	63,099	740,012	950,753	19,318	26,337	487,568	808,603	1,473,660	1,848,792
Nails and spikes.....	215,969	14,549	114,323	39,936	4,750	369	320,616	184,750	655,653	239,604
Structural iron and steel.....	197,334	322,243	922,604	6,569	4,029	425,278	581,707	951,424	1,538,340
Motorcycles.....	176,823	19,258	4,959	6,371	19,798	3,744	28,747	18,804	230,327	48,177
Locomotives.....	162,000	2,739,100	35,350	436,962	271,745	3,338,062	307,095
Railway track material.....	58,909	3,251	317,772	81,155	88,378	291	79,167	161,416	544,226	245,113
Total except foodstuffs.....	29,212,999	4,884,589	11,564,975	4,931,260	2,084,453	574,831	7,729,456	6,243,214	47,591,883	16,613,894
Total.....	63,579,946	16,376,169	12,329,661	6,497,177	14,811,708	2,781,097	14,416,635	9,915,375	105,137,950	35,599,818
Articles partly used for Army supplies showing material decrease in exports to belligerent countries:										
Cotton, raw, including linters.....	34,679,924	97,350,723	3,610,635	5,907,042	3,903,610	3,627,235	469,226	496,317	42,663,365	107,381,317
Copper in pigs and manufactures of.....	6,347,893	9,440,387	789,801	575,393	1,670,210	2,103,345	752,022	120,041	9,559,926	12,239,166
Gasoline and naphtha.....	982,001	1,494,573	242,463	596,533	74,765	123,478	1,054,113	1,038,984	2,353,342	3,253,568
Total.....	42,009,818	108,285,683	4,642,899	7,078,968	5,648,585	5,854,058	2,275,361	1,655,342	54,576,663	122,874,051
Total of foregoing articles.....	145,346,973	125,237,265	22,113,617	14,399,393	20,699,930	8,661,623	18,826,252	13,488,025	206,986,772	161,786,306
Other articles.....	49,903,033	38,519,362	22,882,163	25,358,505	12,597,550	7,995,561	29,441,523	35,343,700	114,827,269	107,217,128
Grand total.....	195,250,006	163,756,627	44,995,780	39,757,898	33,297,480	16,657,184	48,267,775	48,831,725	321,814,041	269,003,434

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if the tables presented by him show the exportation for one month in each of the years 1913 and 1915, or for those two entire years?

Mr. STONE. I read what the tables show. They contain a comparative statement for the months of October, 1913, and October, 1915, which are the months immediately preceding my inquiry.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the matter being printed; but I wish simply to say in this connection that I have a list of exportations of all articles and classes for nine months of the years 1913, 1914, and 1915; that is, the first nine months of each of the three years, and the amount of exportations as classified by the department. For the information of the Senate, without going into details, I will say of those 36 classifications the exportations for the first nine months of 1913 amounted to \$1,733,400,000; for the same months of 1914 the exportations were \$1,467,400,000, or a decrease over the exports for the year 1913; but in the year 1915 the exportations were \$2,532,500,000.

I wish to call attention to some of the items that can be classified as those for which the increased demand has been brought about on account of the war; and call attention to the fact that the difference between the total exportations for 1913 and those for 1915 amounts to \$799,000,000. I wish to call attention to some of the items of increases, showing that the increases were on account of the war and for items used in the war that this increase of exportations occurred. For instance, in the item of cattle, hogs, horses, sheep, mules, and so forth, in 1913 the exports were \$5,600,000, while in 1915 they were \$96,200,000.

In the case of chemicals and drugs, in 1913 the exportations were \$19,800,000, while in 1915 they were \$54,200,000. In the case of explosives, in 1913 the exportations were \$3,800,000, while in 1915 they were \$84,300,000. The exportations of iron and steel manufactures in 1913 were \$226,500,000, in 1915 they were \$251,100,000. In 1913 the exports of meat were \$120,200,000, while in 1915 they were \$194,800,000. The exports of refined sugar in 1913 were \$1,300,000, while in 1915 they were \$24,800,000. The exportations of zinc manufactures in 1913 were \$1,000,000, whereas in 1915 they were \$21,500,000.

Mr. President, I might go on and mention every item and show that most of the increased exportations from this country have been undoubtedly brought about by the war and are made up of those articles that are used in war, and for no other purpose.

The same report also shows that the items that have been usually exported, that go into the everyday life of the people and the commerce of the world, have not been exported to so large an extent in 1915 as in the year 1913.

Mr. President, I simply wanted, in connection with the statement that was made here for one particular month, to call attention to the figures for nine months of the three years, so that there could be no mistake as to the actual conditions.

Mr. STONE. I wish to ask the Senator if it is his purpose to have printed in the Record the statement from which he has quoted?

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly satisfied that it should go into the Record.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator has no objection, I should like to have it go into the Record.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask, then, that the table from which I have quoted be printed in the Record, without my reading it.

Mr. STONE. Yes; I think that had better be done. As the Senator has made comments, I should like to see the document and I should also like to know where he got it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator where I got it. The Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, issues a "Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States," and if the Senator will take the time to examine it, he will find the figures I have quoted.

Mr. STONE. This is a computation made by the Senator himself, based on some reports to which he has the kindness to invite my considerate attention, but it is the Senator's own computation.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not want to claim credit for the work, Mr. President.

The information is gathered from the "Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States."

Mr. STONE. Well, who made the tables—that is the point—from which the Senator was reading a moment ago? Who collated them? Who compiled them?

Mr. SMOOT. The table that I just asked to have put in the Record?

Mr. STONE. The Senator knows what I am talking about—yes; who compiled that?

Mr. SMOOT. It was compiled in my office.

Mr. STONE. Oh, that was what the Senator seemed reluctant to say.

Mr. SMOOT. Not in the least.

Mr. STONE. Now, I will ask that it be printed.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator need not ask that; I have already asked that it be printed in the Record.

Mr. STONE. Then I supplement the Senator's request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter will be printed in the Record, in the absence of objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[In millions of dollars.]

Articles and classes exported.	9 months ended September—		
	1913	1914	1915
Agricultural implements.....	27.6	20.6	10.4
Animals, cattle, hogs, horses, sheep, mules, etc.....	5.6	4.6	96.2
Brass and manufactures.....	6.0	4.9	31.8
Breadstuffs.....	166.8	172.8	423.4
Carriages, automobiles.....	25.7	22.7	85.6
Carriages, all other.....	19.6	9.5	18.9
Chemicals, drugs, etc.....	19.8	20.2	54.2
Copper and manufactures.....	108.6	95.6	83.9
Cotton, raw.....	282.2	242.2	107.3
Cotton, manufactured.....	41.6	34.1	71.1
Electrical machinery, etc.....	21.2	15.2	17.2
Explosives.....	3.8	4.0	84.3
Fiber manufactures.....	8.4	8.2	13.2
Fish and fish products.....	5.2	6.6	10.7
Fruits and nuts.....	19.0	16.2	23.1
Rubber goods.....	10.7	8.6	15.5
Iron and steel manufactures.....	226.5	152.8	251.1
Boots and shoes.....	14.1	12.4	29.8
Leather manufactures.....	32.2	26.7	64.6
Meats.....	120.2	97.7	164.8
Milk products.....	20.2	2.5	15.7
Naval stores.....	17.6	12.2	9.3
Oil cake and oil-cake meal.....	20.4	11.8	23.0
Oils, mineral.....	108.5	108.2	108.2
Oils, vegetable.....	15.6	11.2	23.8
Paints, colors, and varnish.....	5.6	5.3	6.6
Paper and manufactures of.....	15.7	15.2	15.9
Photographic goods.....	6.6	6.5	8.6
Sugar, refined.....	1.3	5.8	24.8
Tobacco manufactures.....	4.7	5.4	4.9
Tobacco, raw.....	39.4	52.5	39.0
Wood, lumber, and other manufactures.....	91.1	65.3	40.3
Wool manufactures.....	3.4	3.5	25.2
Zinc manufactures.....	1.0	3.2	21.5
Articles not enumerated.....	216.8	202.3	250.6
Total.....	1,733.4	1,467.4	2,532.5

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri if the table which he has presented is intended to disclose the amount of our foreign exportations due to the war and the amount not due to the war? If that be so, does this table show what proportion of our foreign exports were to take the place of goods which the nations at war had heretofore sent to those countries, but which, on account of the war, they were unable to send?

Mr. STONE. The tables which I have submitted, and which will appear in the Record to-morrow morning, will show the losses in the way of imports into the neutral nations of Europe—for example, coming from what are now belligerent nations in Europe—and will very clearly disclose, I think, for the month indicated, the increased exports from the United States to such countries due to a falling off of foreign exports to those countries. I think the tables will show that. It might have been better to have covered a period of 3 months or 9 months or 12 months, but I asked simply for this information for a single month as merely indicative of a general condition.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Mr. FLETCHER. On December 10 the Chair laid before the Senate the annual report of the Attorney General for the year 1915, and it was ordered to lie on the table and be printed. I move that the report be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 89) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved February 25, 1915, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 1230. An act to authorize the construction of bridges across the Fox River at Aurora, Ill.; and

S. 2409. An act to authorize the Ohio-West Virginia Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at the city of Steubenville, Jefferson County, Ohio.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HARDING. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of Ohio, which I ask may be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing the Senators and Representatives to Congress from the State of Ohio to support H. R. 12292 as amended, popularly known as the Palmer-Owen bill, designed to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor.

Whereas the people of the State of Ohio, in response to enlightened and humane impulses, have, through their representatives, enacted into statute law, provisions for the protection of the State's most valuable asset—its growing children—such laws prohibiting the employment in mills and factories of children less than 14 years of age and embodying, with the exception of the laws of but one State in the Union, the most advanced legislation upon the subject; and

Whereas the blot of unrestricted—or practically unrestricted—child labor still rests upon a number of States, the youth and future career of the Nation's embryo citizens being sacrificed to the assumed needs of commerce; and

Whereas the reckless waste of future potentiality involved in the industrial exploitation of immature children is uneconomic and wrong and constitutes a crime against childhood and against the race itself; and

Whereas the products of various industries of the State of Ohio, manufactured under humane conditions and without robbing childhood of its birthright, are forced to seek to market in competition with the output of child-labor industries in various States in the Union; and

Whereas Federal H. R. 12292, as amended by the House Committee on Labor, known as the Palmer-Owen bill, seeks to prohibit the shipment in interstate commerce of the products of the labor of little children less than 14 years of age; and

Whereas such H. R. 12292 is indorsed by the American Association for Labor Legislation, by organizations of workers and employers alike, by the leaders in contemporaneous thought, and by all true men and women familiar with its provisions; and

Whereas the State of Ohio, being, as stated in the vanguard of States in the matter of child protection, a peculiar responsibility rests upon her representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That our Senators and Representatives to Congress be requested that they use every legitimate effort to secure the speedy enactment into law of H. R. 12292 as amended.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each such Senator and Representative by the secretary of state of Ohio.

CHARLES D. CONOVER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
JOHN H. ARNOLD,
President of the Senate.

Adopted March 4, 1915.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, C. Q. Hildebrand, secretary of state of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is an exemplified copy, carefully compared by me with the original enrolled resolution now in my official custody

as secretary of state, and found to be true and correct, of house joint resolution No. 18, adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio March 4, 1915, and filed in this office on the 5th day of March, A. D. 1915.

Witness my hand and official seal at Columbus, Ohio, this 6th day of March, A. D. 1915.

C. Q. HILDEBRANT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. NELSON presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens of the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Arthur MacArthur Camp, No. 16, Department of Minnesota, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the discharge of ex-soldiers from Government positions in the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. SHERMAN presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church of Gardner, of the Swedish Free Sunday School of Rootford, and of sundry citizens of Maxon, Bellair, Yale, Crandall, Casey, West York, Pontiac, Martinsville, Bath, Saidora, Odin, Salem, and Xenia, all in the State of Illinois, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of 42 citizens of Hartford and East Hartford, in the State of Connecticut, praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae of Norwalk, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CURTIS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Arkansas City, McPherson, Wichita, Grand River, and Brazilton, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wamego, Kans., praying for the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lyon County, Kans., remonstrating against the placing of a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Washington Post, No. 12, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, of Lawrence, Kans., and a petition of the Women's Relief Corps, No. 9, of Lawrence, Kans., praying for the enactment of more liberal pension laws, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. SHIELDS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 2406) to amend section 162 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 42) thereon.

PEND OREILLE RIVER BRIDGE, IDAHO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 320) to authorize the county of Bonner, Idaho, to construct a bridge across Pend Oreille River, and I submit a report (No. 40) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHATTahoochee RIVER BRIDGE, GEORGIA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 775) granting the consent of Congress to J. P. Jones and others to construct one or more bridges across the Chattahoochee River between the counties of Coweta and Carroll, in the State of Georgia, and I submit a report (No. 41) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 3467) granting a pension to Lawrence E. Brunson;
A bill (S. 3468) granting an increase of pension to Lucy M. Hord;

A bill (S. 3469) granting a pension to James R. Phillips; and
A bill (S. 3470) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 3471) granting a pension to Sadie E. Devault;
A bill (S. 3472) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Runnels;
A bill (S. 3473) granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus H. Ward (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3474) granting an increase of pension to Granville R. Sibley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3475) granting an increase of pension to James Rogers (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3476) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo J. Nevers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3477) making appropriation for investigation and promotion of rural education, industrial education, and school hygiene; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 3478) to establish a military academy at Fort Logan, Colo.; and

A bill (S. 3479) for the relief of Sylvester Howe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3480) granting a pension to Emerson E. Paden;
A bill (S. 3481) granting an increase of pension to James Inman;

A bill (S. 3482) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Harrington; and
A bill (S. 3483) granting a pension to Ferdinand Reinhardt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3484) granting certain lands of the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., to the Washington Historical Society; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3485) to establish in the District of Columbia a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 3486) to establish the Olympic National Park in the Olympic Mountains, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 3487) to credit certain officers of the Medical Department, United States Army, with services rendered as acting assistant surgeons during the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3488) granting an increase of pension to John B. Walden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3489) for the enlargement of the Federal building at San Jose, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 3490) to provide for the sale of public lands in western Kansas in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3491) for the relief of Lou Jahn; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3492) granting a pension to Mary White (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3493) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Baker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3494) granting a pension to Matilda J. Fuller (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3495) granting a pension to George J. Jones (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3496) granting a pension to Mary C. Finlay (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3497) granting an increase of pension to James L. Zeigler (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3498) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Parks (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3499) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Pike (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3500) granting an increase of pension to John W. Baughman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3501) granting an increase of pension to Zenas R. Detwiler (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3502) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Snider (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3503) granting an increase of pension to William Henthorn (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3504) granting a pension to Lemuel Abbott (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3505) for the relief of Henry Wagner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 3506) to prevent the spread of the foot-and-mouth disease, anthrax, hog cholera, and other contagious or infectious diseases of live stock during or in consequence of the carrying of animals by railroad or other means of transportation from any State or Territory or the District of Columbia into or through any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 3507) for the relief of Elizabeth Marsh Watkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 3508) validating and confirming conveyances of lands made by allottees on the Yankton Indian Reservation, the Crow Creek Indian Reservation, and the Rosebud Indian Reservation, all in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HARDING (for Mr. POMERENE):

A bill (S. 3509) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a deed to the persons hereinafter named for part of a lot in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 3510) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Cain (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3511) granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Perry;

A bill (S. 3512) granting an increase of pension to John F. Smith; and

A bill (S. 3513) granting an increase of pension to George W. Howe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3514) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Abbott (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 3515) granting an increase of pension to Sidney A. Ladd (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 3516) granting a pension to Mary M. Duffy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 3517) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, to cooperate with the authorities of the States accepting this act in the construction of certain highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HARDING:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) directing the Bureau of Education to take such steps as are compatible with Federal authority to encourage the teaching of the Spanish language in the United States of America; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to present a concurrent resolution, now hastily drawn, authorizing the President of the United States to exercise the same power with the Army and Navy in Mexico that is now exercised in Nicaragua and Haiti by our Navy under previous laws concerning their conditions and the maintenance of the peace and security of citizens and property of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator have the resolution read?

Mr. LEWIS. No, Mr. President. It may take the usual course. At another time I purpose addressing myself to the resolution.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Illinois to refer to the use of the Army in Nicaragua and Haiti.

Mr. LEWIS. The resolution seeks to authorize the use of the Army and Navy in Mexico under the authority by which we use the Navy in Haiti and Nicaragua.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the resolution to lie on the table, or is it to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. LEWIS. For the present I prefer to have it lie on the table, sir, if that is consistent with the rule, and to have it printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

Mr. LEWIS. I will amend the resolution later. It is rather crudely and hastily drawn. I shall have it substituted by another in more perfect form.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the President of the United States be authorized and empowered to order the Army of the United States, or any necessary part thereof, to the country of Mexico and to there cooperate with any force there existing which to the President shall seem appropriate for the object of protecting the citizens and property of the United States and to punish those violating the security of its citizens, and to authorize the President to use the military and naval forces of the United States in Mexico to the same extent as now by law permitted the Navy in Nicaragua and Haiti for the protection of American rights.

PROPOSED CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL LAW.

Mr. McCUMBER. I offer a concurrent resolution, and as it is very short and rather pertinent to present conditions, I ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to call a convention of all of the nations of the world to meet in Washington, at such time as he may designate, for the purpose of drafting a code of international law and rules of international conduct, which shall apply to all of the nations of the earth, such code and rules to be adopted and agreed to by such nations, and to be enforced under a joint agreement by all of the nations against any one or more which shall disobey the code and regulations so adopted; that provision shall be had for a permanent international legislative assembly, which shall from time to time enact such further international code, rules, and regulations as in their wisdom may be necessary to preserve the rights of all such nations, with provision for continuity of such legislative body; the purpose of this act, when carried into effect, being to provide for final disarmament of all the nations of the world, preserving in each one such armies and navies as may be proper and necessary for its own police protection and regulations and enforcing all international rights and duties by the combined efforts of all the nations; such legislative assembly to provide for a general court of arbitration for the settlement of all international disputes and the power of all of the nations to be exercised to compel the submission of such questions to arbitration and the enforcement of the judgment of the arbitrary tribunal, pending the continuance of the present war in Europe, and in the event of the failure of the warring nations at present to join in such international convention, the President is authorized to call together all of the neutral nations of the world and secure, if possible, such a code, guaranteed by the respective nations, and to secure as speedily as possible the consent of the several warring nations to enter into such an agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What disposition will the Senator have made of the resolution?

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask its reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ARTICLE BY ARTHUR M'DONALD.

Mr. CLAPP. I present a copy of an article by Arthur McDonald, anthropologist, of Washington, D. C., entitled "Peace, War, and Humanity," which I would like to have printed as a public document. I therefore ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing with a view to its publication.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The article will be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

ADDRESS BY HON. CYRUS KEHR.

Mr. SHIELDS. I have a copy of an address by Hon. Cyrus Kehr, of Knoxville, Tenn., delivered before the American Civic Association at a recent meeting of that association in Washington, D. C., December 31, 1915, on the subject of a national system of highways and landscape designing. I am desirous of having the address printed as a public document, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paper will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

JEWISH IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. CLAPP. I ask that 15,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 611, Sixty-third Congress, second session, be printed for the use of the Senate document room. It is a report of a subcommittee of the National Jewish Immigration Council appointed to examine into the question of illiteracy among Jewish immigrants and its causes. There is a very large demand for the document, and it is not voluminous by any means, and it has already been published.

Mr. CHILTON. Of course nothing can be done with it unless there is an estimate made for the printing.

Mr. CLAPP. That is only necessary where the cost will exceed \$500, and this will not exceed, at the outside, \$125.

Mr. CHILTON. I have no objection, so far as I am concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved February 25, 1915, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 381 be taken up for consideration at this time.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, this is the bill that was pending yesterday evening upon adjournment. I could not consider the parts of the President's message relating to the public revenues and keep within the ordinary parliamentary limitations, except for the rule that prevails within this body, which is different from that which confines the preacher to the text.

I am not desirous of making any prolonged address upon the Philippine question. I have observed with deep gratification, in the course of the discussion of the Philippine question, the development of a single economic condition. That condition was briefly referred to by the chairman of the Committee on the Philippine Islands [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and elaborated by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH]. It showed, very commendably, that economies had been made possible in the civil administration of the affairs of that archipelago.

That is a very gratifying condition. It is tinged with regret, however, that economy begins a third of the way around the world, and, like foreign missions, it goes to the heathen of other lands, to the neglect of the economic heathen here at home.

I have not, in the time that I have been permitted on this floor hitherto, observed in this administration any visible economy in the departments or in the administration of governmental affairs. I have, however, observed the contrary. It is well enough for the economies to begin in the Philippine Islands. It is like the payment of taxes; we always are unanimously in favor of the other fellow's paying them. If anybody's salary is to be reduced, I am heartily in favor of beginning on the Filipino. The cost of living, so I am advised by gentlemen who have sojourned in those parts, is not so high there as it is in the United States where the climate is not so temperate. Wardrobes are more expensive here, and the usual diet of the Filipinos would make them fit subjects on which to practice economy. I shall sincerely advocate, after an appropriate interval, the extension of the economies practiced in that country to our own.

Taxation is an inseparable companion of public revenues. The sources of revenue are enduring subjects of controversy. So long as government exists, they will provoke earnest disputes. It is a permanent condition that makes the tariff the center of constantly recurring struggles. No one experienced in actual legislation believes the tariff can be removed from politics until the sources of revenue and the methods of taxation cease to provoke differences of opinion.

Customs duties under Republican administration supplied approximately one-half of our total Treasury receipts, except during the Civil War and the Spanish-American War, when extraordinary demands were met by direct special taxes. Under Democratic administrations from one-third to 40 per cent are derived from customs, and the remainder are from direct taxes.

For many years the Democratic Party has declared for a tariff solely for revenue. The Baltimore platform of 1912 followed that principle. Those into whose hands fell the power of legislation framed a hybrid species known as a "competitive tariff."

The ostensible purpose claimed is that when the duties "are high enough to allow the American manufacturer to make a profit before his competitor can enter the field" such duties must be lowered to enable his foreign competitor to sell in our markets. Inevitably the American producer's profit is singled out here for attack.

It is said that—

The protection of any profit must of necessity have a tendency to destroy competition and create monopoly, whether the profit protected is reasonable or unreasonable.

I quote from the House committee report in 1913.

It can fairly be inferred that one purpose of the 1913 tariff was to destroy the producers' profit. This is the only success achieved. This absence of profit has not subtracted from the cost of living by a penny. The protection of wage schedules is ignored. The dominant motive is to create competition with the employer who must pay the wages.

Profit to the American employer and manufacturer is condemned and pursued by a competitive tariff to the vanishing point. What profit the foreign manufacturer may gain on his wage scale when selling in our market does not concern this administration in raising revenue. What legitimate industries like iron and steel, sugar, or leather manufactures, agricultural implements, sewing machines, the great grain and live-stock interests, or chemicals may be injured or destroyed by a competitive tariff create no anxiety. What pay rolls are scattered and wages lost do not disturb the gentlemen who follow this destructive practice.

Everybody is asked to forget it when the war orders pour "the cornucopia of plenty" over the country, to borrow a significant phrase used not long ago in this Chamber. Mere phrases can not obliterate the memories of industrial depression temporarily stayed by commerce in war supplies.

The cost of living is not reduced by a competitive tariff. The ability, however, to buy staples by all who support themselves and dependent ones by their earning capacity has been impaired or destroyed by the futile effort to demonstrate a theory. Employees who have felt the hardships of attempting to shift their occupations are not convinced by academic reports of visionary gentlemen who tell them their employers do not know how to run their business. The wage earner will be skeptical about instructing his employer by some one who knows nothing about business. In Republican years his employer managed his business so as to maintain pay rolls and make a reasonable profit. In the absence of war orders we can not now do either.

DEMOCRATIC PROMISES.

The tariff revision act of this administration was signed October 3, 1913. On that occasion the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee said:

I am absolutely confident that this law will reduce the cost of living in the United States and will provide ample revenue for the Government.

Speaker CLARK, of the House, in the autumn of 1913, in an address in Maine said:

We believe our tariff bill will reduce the cost of living and at the same time raise abundant revenue.

The report of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House on the tariff bill in 1913 admitted that, according to expert computations, it would probably fail to produce the amount of customs revenue its predecessor did by \$37,896,000. It said further:

The saving thus made in revenue collections is only suggestive of the immensely greater savings secured to the public by the probable change in prices resulting from the removal of the excessive rates of the present law.

This difference was to be supplied by the income tax. It is essential to remember that this report from the House, which alone is given constitutional power to originate money bills, explicitly states that the only deficit apprehended was the difference in the customs collected under the revision and the customs duties collected under the Republican act of 1909. It was proposed to supply this deficiency by the income tax. No other source of revenue was mentioned as necessary fully to supply the Government with adequate revenue.

The House minority report accompanying the majority report reminded the Democratic administration that—

No new administration ever inherited such a full Treasury and such abundant revenue. In view of the official Treasury statement, all must admit the prosperous condition of our governmental finances. The people of the country have been more prosperous than ever before in our history. There is no excuse for the radical change in our revenue system proposed by this bill. The party proposing it is in power not by the grace of the majority of the American people but by a division in the ranks of the majority on other questions than that of protection. The administration has the power to enact this legislation. The accounting for the abuse of that power will come later.

The Senate Finance Committee, reporting on the floor of this Chamber in July, 1913, took occasion to say:

Revenues for the current fiscal year, and especially those from customs receipts, though covering a period of transition from a policy of high protection to a policy of competitive tariff legislation, will be

fully equal to the expenditures appropriated for the corresponding period.

It is stated further in this report that under this bill there will be a surplus of receipts over expenditures. It was urged that a competitive tariff must be substituted for a protective tariff. Greatly increased imports were predicted. Their competitive effect in our markets, it was said, would reduce the cost of living. That prediction has signally failed.

WHAT BECAME OF THE MONEY?

The responsible leader of the House majority declared a few days ago, in substance, that the Democratic administration has appropriated less money than the preceding Republican one. It is asserted by his predecessor, now a Member of the Senate, that the tariff act of 1913 produced more revenue than the Payne-Aldrich law.

If less money is appropriated, as claimed by the House leader, and more revenue is collected under the law of 1913 than under its predecessor, then, with increased revenue and with lower appropriations it is a pertinent inquiry what becomes of the money, Mr. President. I should like to have this interesting psychological financial exhibit explained in some way so that it can be demonstrated where the resulting surplus revenues have gone.

So far the only visible results of this happy state of affairs is the President's annual message asking for increased taxation and a constant decrease in the general fund balance. In the absence of military and naval increases for preparedness still additional taxes would be needed to avert a deficit. Mr. President, the prodigal son was considerably more candid in his explanation. When his balance met the fate of all spendthrifts in private life he owned up and repentant returned to an improved diet and sounder finances.

Statistics of several years have been assembled in this Chamber and invidious comparisons made greatly to the comfort of an embarrassed administration. Figures, of course, will not deceive, but the persons who handle them can produce some astounding conclusions. No greater hallucinations ever seized upon the human mind than when it is permitted to run at large among a lot of statistics. It is fit that some of those conclusions be examined in the light of the entire financial record affecting the receipts and expenditures of the last two fiscal years.

COMPARISONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Let me premise the statement by saying that the election of 1910 sent 228 Democrats and 160 Republicans to the House, a party majority of 68. The House possesses the exclusive power to originate money bills. The legislation of the House began in 1911 with the Sixty-second Congress and ended March 4, 1913. With a Republican majority still remaining in the Senate and a Republican President, some restraint was laid upon whatever extravagant propensities appeared in the House.

The Sixty-second Congress appropriated, exclusive of the Post Office, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1912, and ending June 30, 1913, \$695,693,760.06. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1913, and ending June 30, 1914, 768,166,710.41.

Total appropriations by Sixty-second Congress, exclusive of Post Office, 1,463,860,470.47. The Sixty-second Congress appropriated for the Panama Canal, 53,172,343.00.

Leaving appropriations by Sixty-second Congress, exclusive of Panama Canal and Post Office, 1,410,688,127.47.

The ordinary receipts for the fiscal years beginning: July 1, 1912, and ending June 30, 1913, exclusive of postal receipts, were, 724,111,229.84. July 1, 1913, and ending June 30, 1914, exclusive of postal receipts, were, 734,673,166.71.

Total ordinary receipts, fiscal years 1913 and 1914, 1,458,784,396.55. If the Panama Canal appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1913, and June 30, 1914, are deducted, there was appropriated by the Sixty-second Congress, exclusive of Post Office, 1,410,686,127.47.

Leaving excess of receipts for fiscal years ending June 30, 1913, and June 30, 1914, over appropriations by Sixty-second Congress, exclusive of Panama Canal and Post Office, of, 48,096,269.08.

If the Panama Canal appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1913, and June 30, 1914, be paid out of the ordinary receipts for these years, the appropriations of the Sixty-second Congress, exclusive of Post Office and including Panama Canal, were, 1,463,860,470.47. And the total ordinary receipts for those years were, 1,458,784,396.55.

Leaving an excess of appropriations by Sixty-second Congress, exclusive of Post Office, over ordinary receipts of, 5,076,093.92.

The Sixty-third Congress was Democratic in House and Senate, with a Democratic Executive. It convened in extra session April 7, 1913, and remained in session practically until March 4, 1915, when it expired by law and not by its voluntary act.

It appropriated, exclusive of the Post Office, for—

The fiscal year beginning July 1, 1914, and ending June 30, 1915, \$802,753,471.55. The fiscal year beginning July 1, 1915, and ending June 30, 1916, 801,572,345.02.

Total appropriations by Sixty-third Congress, exclusive of Post Office, 1,604,325,816.57. The Sixty-third Congress appropriated for Panama Canal, 41,921,573.30.

Leaving appropriations by Sixty-third Congress, exclusive of Panama Canal and Post Office, 1,562,404,243.27.

The ordinary receipts for the fiscal years—Beginning July 1, 1914, and ending June 30, 1915, exclusive of postal receipts, were, 697,910,827.58. Beginning July 1, 1915, and ending June 30, 1916, exclusive of postal revenues unless additional revenue receipts shall be procured by new legislation, estimating the receipts of 1916 as the same as 1915, 697,910,827.58.

Making total ordinary receipts, fiscal years of 1915 and 1916, 1,395,821,655.16.

If the Panama Canal appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1915, and June 30, 1916, are deducted, there was appropriated by the Sixty-third Congress, exclusive of Post Office, 1,562,404,243.27.

Leaving excess of appropriations for fiscal years ending June 30, 1915, and June 30, 1916, exclusive of Panama Canal and Post Office, of, 166,582,588.11.

If the Panama Canal appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1915, and June 30, 1916, be paid out of ordinary receipts for those years, the appropriations of the Sixty-third Congress, exclusive of Post Office and including Panama Canal, are, 1,604,325,816.75.

And total ordinary receipts, estimating the receipts of 1916 under present revenue laws, the same as 1915, will for those years be, 1,395,821,655.16.

Leaving an excess of appropriations by Sixty-third Congress, exclusive of Post Office, over ordinary receipts, of, 208,504,161.59.

I think it is proper here to notice a statement made not long ago in this Chamber—a most remarkable assumption by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to relieve this administration from the financial plight in which it is placed by its own legislation. The first year of the tariff act of October 3, 1913, is credited with producing \$734,343,700. This fiscal year began July 1, 1913, and ended June 30, 1914.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, it seems to me that in such an important discussion as this, concerning Democratic policies, there should be more than two Democrats present on the other side of the Chamber. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fall	Lodge	Simmons
Bankhead	Fletcher	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Gore	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Gronna	Myers	Smoot
Bryan	Harding	Nelson	Sterling
Catron	Hughes	Oliver	Stone
Chamberlain	James	Page	Sutherland
Chilton	Johnson, Me.	Phelan	Swanson
Clapp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Poindexter	Thompson
Cole	Kenyon	Shafroth	Townsend
Cummins	Lane	Sheppard	Underwood
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Sherman	Weeks
Dillingham	Lewis	Shields	Works

Mr. ASHURST. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is unavoidably absent from the Chamber.

Mr. STONE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. REED] is absent on important business. He is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I wish also to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is confined at home by sickness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], who is absent from the city, is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. Goff] is detained from the Senate on account of illness. I desire also to announce that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KEEN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are also unavoidably absent. The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KEEN] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER].

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] are detained on official business. I wish also to announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty Senators have responded to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Illinois will proceed.

DUTIES COLLECTED.

Mr. SHERMAN. Duties were collected from July 1, 1913, to October 4, 1913, under the Republican rates of the act of 1909 in the sum of \$88,617,096. If the rate of duties in the Democratic act of October 3, 1913, had applied from July 1, 1913, to October 4, 1913, customs of only \$57,000,000 would have been collected on the same volume of imports for this interval. This is an excess revenue of \$31,617,096. Duties on wool were continued from October 3, 1913, to December 1, 1913; on woolen manufactures until January 1, 1914, and on sugar until March 1, 1914. The last three items produced before the dates named an excess of revenue over that which would have been collected from the same volume of imports if the October 3, 1913, rates, or free list, had been applied, of \$20,287,864.

The revenue-producing capacity of the act of October 3, 1913, is measured by stripping it of the revenue it did not collect. Fifty-one million nine hundred and four thousand nine hundred and sixty dollars must be deducted from its revenue for the year ending June 30, 1914. The actual revenue produced by it is \$682,768,206.71. The last year of the Payne-Aldrich Act, ending June 30, 1913, collected \$724,111,229. The new act collected \$41,343,023 less than the preceding Republican act.

With this loss of revenues, the appropriations of the Sixty-third Congress showed no reduction. If a normal increase be allowed, still no excuse for the totals of that Congress can be justified. The Sixty-third Congress was wholly Democratic. Its total of appropriations, exclusive of the Post Office, were \$1,604,325,816.57. The Sixty-first Congress was wholly Republican. Its total appropriations were \$1,453,084,293.99. This is an increase of \$151,241,522.58 in four years.

The Sixty-second Congress was Democratic in the House. They held the absolute power to prevent any appropriations. The Senate and the Executive were Republican. Its total appropriations, exclusive of the Post Office, were \$1,463,860,470.47. The Democratic Sixty-third Congress exceeded it \$140,465,345.90. The total appropriations of the Sixty-second Congress, Republican in the Senate and Executive, were \$1,463,860,470.47, as compared with the total appropriations of the wholly Republican Sixty-first Congress of \$1,453,084,293.99. This is an increase of only \$10,776,176.48 in two years between the Sixty-first and the Sixty-second Congress.

Let this be compared with the increase in appropriations of \$151,245,522.58 between the Sixty-first and the Sixty-third Congress and the increase of \$140,465,345.90 between the Sixty-second and the Sixty-third Congress.

Here is the fit place to extract a plank from that weather-beaten derelict known as the Baltimore Democratic platform of 1912. It is labeled—

"REPUBLICAN EXTRAVAGANCE."

We denounce the prodigal waste of money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

This astonishing declaration tested by the cold, impartial light of two years of recorded performance is worth even less than the single-term curiosity that is reposing, forgotten and

unused, in that document. It is a very pertinent inquiry, Where has this one hundred and forty or one hundred and fifty million dollar increase gone in these appropriations?

I might parenthetically remark here, Mr. President, while it is pertinent, that in the estimates of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is found some very edifying material. The ordinary internal-revenue receipts for 1916 are estimated at a little short of \$300,000,000; the estimated receipts from corporation and individual income taxes are estimated at about \$90,000,000.

I have been looking over the pay roll in the department, and I find that it costs the salaries of nearly as many employees in the corporation and individual income-tax department to collect \$90,000,000 as it does in the ordinary internal-revenue receipts department to collect nearly \$300,000,000. In the ordinary internal-revenue receipts department the employees are 276 in number; in the estimates of the money that will be provided by an indulgent Congress for the employees required to collect \$90,000,000 of corporation and individual income-tax receipts it will take 254 employees, within 22 of as many as are required to collect \$300,000,000; and here is the first visible fruit of that economy and simplicity so essential to a Democratic government.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do for a question, but I do not want to lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois yields for a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not examined the record with a view of ascertaining how many men are employed in connection with the collection of the income tax. I think when the present tariff law was passed we did make provision for an additional force to collect the individual income tax which that act imposed. My recollection is that the number of officials provided for was less than a hundred in the office and field force. I am not quite definite about that; but less than a hundred is my recollection. Of course, there were already a number of officials in the department who were employed in the collection of the corporation tax. Their service began under the old administration, because the corporation tax was imposed before the beginning of the present administration and before the passage of the tariff act of 1913. I am not prepared to say further than that about it, but my recollection is that it was 84, less than a hundred, that we added to the income-tax force. I do not think that that is an excessive number.

Mr. SMOOT rose.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Utah has looked it up. Does the Senator from Utah have the exact number?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I was looking at the law itself. The law itself does not provide any number, but in the appropriation bill—

Mr. SIMMONS. There was an estimate submitted for the general appropriation bill, and I think the appropriation was about \$290,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state to the Senator that the appropriation bill provided perhaps for the number of which the Senator speaks to take care of the first two months of the work, but I will say to the Senator that since that time there have been a great many employees added to the number provided for originally by the appropriation bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would not say a great number, but I think the appropriation bill did make some addition. Those men also had to look after collections under the emergency act after it went into effect.

Mr. GALLINGER. And outside of the civil service.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. But that was the estimate at that time. Others were added, especially the passage of the emergency act. As to the number employed in connection with the corporation tax, I do not know; I have no information about that, but I presume the Senator has looked that up. What I wanted to ask the Senator is this—because it bears upon the question of whether the cost for the collection of this tax is excessive—what is the percentage cost of collecting the income tax?

I ask the Senator that question because my impression is, as a result of a conversation I had some time ago with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, that this tax has been collected at a relatively small percentage of cost to the Government. I do not mean by that to say that it has been collected at the same percentage of cost that our internal-revenue taxes are collected,

and I think if the Senator will consider the difference in character between the two kinds of taxes he will see that it is not reasonable to suppose that it could be collected at as low a cost as these taxes, certainly not when we consider the many difficulties we have had in getting taxpayers to make proper assessments and returns, making it necessary and wise for the department to put a large force of men in the field for the purpose of checking up and correcting improper assessments and seeing that incomes are properly listed. I think I recall reading in a report of the Secretary of the Treasury a statement that so many of the returns showed upon their face circumstances of such suspicion that it was felt necessary to detail the full available force to this work of examination and investigation; and as a result the amount added to the assessments against the individuals investigated, being only a small per cent of those who have been set apart to be investigated, runs away up into the millions of dollars. I think the statement was to the effect that several hundred thousand such cases were yet to be investigated, but that the department did not have sufficient force in order to make the investigation within reasonable time.

I am stating these facts to impress my thought upon the Senator's mind that, of course, he could not properly compare the cost of collecting this tax during the first year of the operation of this new law with the cost of collecting the internal revenue, which is an old system, well established.

One internal-revenue office in my State, in the town of Winston-Salem—where there is but one deputy and two clerks, all of whom together do not receive over \$5,000 compensation—collects something about \$600,000 a month of internal revenue, largely, almost entirely, in stamp taxes upon tobacco, the cost being small. This is merely a random illustration. We collect our internal revenue at a very small percentage, I think, somewhere about one and a half per cent; not over that. I am not pretending to speak accurately, because I do not carry the figures in my mind. Again I ask the Senator if he has any information he can give the Senate showing the percentage cost of the collection of the personal-income tax?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think so. Mr. President, the inquiry is certainly a proper one. The beginning of the collection of the income and the present corporation tax found preceding it the old corporation tax, imposed under a different act. There were considerable data and some trained force in the Internal-Revenue Department for the collection of the corporation tax. When the change came this force was transferred in the department and in the several internal-revenue districts of the United States to the present line of service.

The first year under the act of 1913, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, there was collected, as the Senator will remember, a total of some \$58,000,000—that was for a fractional year, it ought fairly to be stated, and not for an entire year—of income tax from both corporations and individuals. That was not for a full year, as I stated; but a portion of the employees from the old corporation-income tax were transferred to that service. They were not novices in the business. Neither was the collection of the corporation tax a novel source of revenue, nor was it an unusual method of collecting revenue. We had had some experience in collecting revenues from the different corporations subject to tax throughout the country. Therefore, in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, we had the first of the full years of the internal-revenue receipts from corporation and individual income taxes.

I think the Senator will find, by referring to the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, that it cost \$1.64 per thousand to collect for the last fiscal year as compared with \$1.52 for the preceding year. There has been, according to my recollection, an increase in the cost. That is for the general revenue receipts of the department of which the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is the head. In other words, the cost is increasing.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois further yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply desire to ask the Senator please to repeat that figure. Some one interrupted me, and I did not catch it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will do so. I stated that for this fiscal year the cost of collection was \$1.64 per thousand, as compared with a cost for the preceding fiscal year of \$1.52. I am quoting now from memory. It is a matter which I had not intended to take the time of the Senate to discuss. What it costs to collect the individual income tax and the corporation income tax when segregated from the entire internal-revenue receipts I can not now tell the Senator. The figures are readily accessible. I am only referring to the corporation tax that was formerly levied,

for the purpose of showing that there was a trained force that was transferred at that time to the present force, and numerous additions have been made.

The total receipts by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue from fermented spirits, distilled liquors, tobaccos, and the like, and from various other sources, such as oleomargarine, together with the income from corporations and individual income-tax receipts, have made up the total receipts. Then I separate the pay roll necessary to collect these receipts. The pay roll in the ordinary internal-revenue receipts of the department aggregates 276 persons. The pay roll in the corporation and individual income-tax receipts aggregates 254 persons—22 more in the department that collects nearly three hundred millions of revenue, estimated receipts, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916; only 22 more employees to collect this entire sum than are found in the collection of the corporation and individual income-tax receipts estimated at \$90,000,000, with a total of 254 employees. These are the figures as I have compiled them from accessible reports and estimates up to this time.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that instead of costing more to collect income tax and corporation tax, it ought to cost less.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois further yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator does not understand me as asserting that the force that is now employed for the collection of the corporation tax is inadequate. I think that force is entirely adequate. I do not think that force has been increased, however, under this administration. I think the only increase has been with reference to the personal tax. Although we have increased somewhat the corporation tax, I do not think we have increased at all the expense of collecting that tax.

Does the Senator insist that after his segregation of the force assigned to collect the personal income tax from that engaged in collecting the corporation tax, the rate paid and the force employed in collecting the income tax is excessive as compared with that employed and the amount paid out by the Government in the collection of the corporation tax?

Mr. SHERMAN. No, sir.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then does the Senator insist that the cost of collecting the additional income taxes—that is to say, the personal income taxes—provided for in the present tariff law is greater per dollar collected than the cost of collecting the corporation tax under the old law which originally imposed that tax? Has the Senator investigated that matter?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not know, when you segregate the individual income tax from the corporation tax and compare the corporation tax for the last fiscal year with the preceding year before the act of 1913, whether there is an excess of charges or not. I have not the figures before me.

Mr. SIMMONS. The point I am trying to get the Senator to consider is this: I think the Senator is going far afield when he undertakes to institute a comparison between the cost of collecting the income tax and the cost of collecting the general internal-revenue taxes on tobacco and on whisky in the main. Using again the illustration that I made from my own State, there is a tax of about \$600,000—I do not remember the exact amount—collected per month in a little office, where they have three poorly paid men, the total cost being less than \$5,000. That is a mere illustration of the manner of collecting and the small cost attached to the collection of a large part of our internal-revenue taxation throughout the country.

In some districts there are immense whisky distilleries. The tax is paid from one office. The stamps are sold, and they are put on. It takes only a very few officers in order to perform that duty. In the case of tobacco, the production of which is rather concentrated at a few points, immense sums of money are collected in one small office.

The Senator can not in fairness compare the cost of collecting money under that service with the cost of collecting money under the income-tax provision. It is wholly different. Take my illustration again. In one office in my State that much money is collected by three men in one month; and yet we do not collect from the whole State of North Carolina a quarter of a million dollars of income tax. Still, unless we had a considerable force in that State traveling about looking after the Government's interests, we probably would not collect anything like that amount. The very process, the very nature of the thing, requires more expense.

I say you can not compare the cost of collecting the income tax, either corporate or personal, with the cost of collecting the internal-revenue tax. The only proper comparison is the cost of collecting the additional income tax provided in the new tariff law with the cost of collecting the old corporation tax under

the old law. If the Senator had those figures, they would throw some light upon the matter.

So far as I am concerned, there are no partisan considerations governing my position in this matter. I have interrupted the Senator, and I am saying this because I think, first, his comparison is unjust, and because the Secretary of the Treasury, in his report that I now have before me, tries to impress upon the Congress the necessity of an increase in the force in order more perfectly and efficiently to collect the income tax. If the Senator will pardon me, I should like to read in this connection, in justice to the department, what the Secretary says in recommending that this force should be increased rather than diminished.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection. I should like to have it in the Record.

Mr. SIMMONS. After recommending the increase he says:

It is absolutely certain that the Government is losing, through inaccurate returns and evasions of the law, a sum many times greater than the cost of the necessary field force to investigate and check the returns and to bring to account those who are failing to make returns as required by law.

Let us consider the matter of checking the returns: The total number of personal returns for income tax for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915, was 357,515. The total number of corporation returns for the same year was 338,860. Of these returns the preliminary examination in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has shown that 5 per cent of the individual returns and 15 per cent of the corporation returns reveal on their face that they require an investigation. Even this small percentage of the returns is largely in excess of the number the available field force now authorized will be able to examine.

For the fiscal year 1915 there was a total of 295,723 personal and corporation income-tax returns to be examined, and with the present force of 274 field officers, making examinations at the same average rate as experience has shown that they are able to go, it will require three and a half years for this force to complete the examination of the transcripts that will be sent to the agents for examination in the present fiscal year. With the accumulations of succeeding years this force, unless greatly enlarged, will be unable to keep up with the essential work that must be done if we are to effectively administer the income-tax law.

Now, let me show the result of these examinations.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has informed me that taking the total number of agents' reports of examinations of personal returns for the months of June, July, August, and September, 1915, as a basis for calculation, 63 per cent of the returns examined showed that an additional average tax of \$150.07 was due the Government on each return. On this basis the 31,101 returns yet to be examined would produce \$4,667,327 additional tax.

Taking the total number of agents' reports of examinations of corporation returns for the months of June, July, August, and September, 1915, as a basis for calculation, 63 per cent of the returns examined showed that an additional average tax of \$78.95 was due the Government on each return. On this basis the 264,622 returns yet to be examined should produce \$20,891,906.90.

So these men are confronted with a situation with reference to the returns growing out of the disposition of people to escape this tax which makes it necessary, if the Government is to be protected in its revenues, that there should be a big force always in the field.

Mr. SHERMAN. That illustrates the peculiar method of raising revenue which is favored by this administration. Ordinarily from 50 to 52 per cent would be raised by customs.

Mr. SIMMONS. Most of that, if the Senator will pardon me, was with reference to a method employed by the other party before we came in and which we simply adopted.

Mr. SHERMAN. That was for the corporation tax?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. The method of collecting the income tax under the act prior to 1913 is admitted by the course of argument and the figures cited by the Senator to be more expensive than the ordinary internal-revenue collection. I can read from the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue a great many details showing the difficulties of collecting the tax on oleomargarine. It is as difficult to prevent moonshining as it is to keep track of the different corporations and the different individuals subject to tax.

The oleomargarine man thinks he has about as much right to make a substitute for butter and color it without paying the Federal tax as the man who raises corn down some convenient ravine near a brook thinks he has a right to distill whisky out of the grain that he raises. So that makes trouble, and it requires expenditures to run down the offender. In all the large centers of population where oleomargarine is manufactured you will find inspector on inspector and deputy piled upon deputy attempting to collect this tax so that none shall escape. With fermented and distilled liquor there is the same difficulty; it is difficult to compel everybody to pay the tax. The liquor-dealers tax is not collected without a large force of traveling deputies. I see no particular reason why the corporation-income tax or the individual-income tax is more difficult of collection than the ordinary liquor dealer's tax. Constant vigilance is required.

Every term of every Federal district court has constantly upon its docket men charged with selling liquor without a license. In the common parlance the boot-legger cases occupy a considerable space of every docket at every term of court in the various districts of the United States. It is a difficult tax to collect. It is equally as difficult as the individual income or the corporation income tax. Upon the merits of the question there is no more reason why more employees are required to collect an income tax than there is a liquor dealer's tax. The figures read from the report and the argument made by the Senator prove nothing except the inherent difficulty of collecting a tax which is a favorite source of revenue in the bill which he successfully managed on the floor of the Senate in 1913. I am reminded of a quotation:

In law, what plea so tainted and corrupt
But being season'd with a gracious voice
Obscures the show of evil?

I always like to hear the Senator from North Carolina talk. He is comprehensive in his generalizations but somewhat mistaken in detail; and mathematics, unlike politics, is an exact science, Mr. President. I do not myself think there is any justification to be found in the pay rolls of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of 254 men in one department and 276 in another. Even if it be admitted that it is only by inquisitorial processes, only by the rack and thumbscrew that you can get money out of anybody who has an income in this country under a Democratic tariff act and administration; if that be admitted, why this very great discrepancy in the amount of revenue collected by ordinary receipts in the department of nearly \$300,000,000, with only 276 employees, compared with less than \$90,000,000, with 254 employees? The matter is not satisfactorily accounted for among the killed, wounded, and missing, to adopt a phrase used by the commander after the casualties.

I now refer to the plank in the platform, Mr. President, from which I was temporarily diverted, but to which I return with considerable pleasure. This astonishing declaration tested by the cold, impartial light of two years of recorded performance is worth even less than the single-term curiosity that is reposing, forgotten and unused, in that document. It is a very pertinent inquiry, Where has this one hundred and forty or one hundred and fifty million dollar increase gone in these appropriations?

It is pertinent to remark here that the letter of the Chief Executive, dated the 5th day of February, 1913, on the single-term question seems to dispose of another plank in that platform.

Now, with this increase in appropriations of between one hundred and forty and one hundred and fifty million dollars, what have we to show for it? Increased pay rolls, new offices, additional expenditures, more items added to every bill that has come in for more than two years. No unusual strength to the Army and the Navy has found any place in these additional appropriations.

In December, 1913, and since at regular intervals we have had several Executive messages. In one of them we were admonished by the Chief Magistrate not to be nervous or excited, although war was in progress across the sea, although we had been talking about preparedness for some time, although, if there were any yellow peril in the Orient, it existed long before that time. The land laws of California had been a mooted question. The effect of the treaty on a statute of the State in the holding of land had been raised long before. The article written by the prime minister of Japan and inserted in the Record, it is true, had not appeared; but many of the Japanese statesmen had repeated their views of the land question in the different States and especially in the Pacific Coast States. They had said, and had said in many places, that they regarded the denial to their citizens or subjects in this country of the right to hold land as an infraction of the treaty, and if it were not that it was something that concerned the Japanese in a world-wide problem. All of that had happened long before this message came in. Still we were admonished not to be nervous or excited.

Our neighbors may be killed in Mexico, they may be destroyed by submarines in foreign waters, our peace merchandise by the millions of dollars may be taken when sailing under a neutral flag clearing from a neutral port with a neutral destination, with not an article in the cargo contraband of war, conditional or absolute, peace merchandise in every sense—all that might have happened, and still we are not to be nervous or excited. We are to have that calm equipoise which belongs only to the superior beings who walk unruffled under all emergencies.

Now comes preparedness, and in the wake of preparedness always walks the taxgatherer taking his toll. I shall differ

from my Democratic brethren on the sources of revenue or the methods of collecting it. I shall not, perhaps, very materially differ from many of them on the question of adequate preparation. But in all these appropriations, Mr. President, which have been added there has been no great increase for that object. I remember only a few years ago when the House, controlled by the majority party, opposed the building of battleships, opposed the increase of the Navy, opposed coast fortifications, opposed even the lighthouses on the coast to safeguard the hardy mariner from the perils of the sea. I can remember all that. Now, suddenly the chief becomes nervous and excited, and preparation on every hand is the note to be struck.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WORKS. The Senator makes the statement that he will probably not differ very materially from a good many other Senators on the question of preparedness, adequate preparedness. I should like to ask the Senator what he regards as adequate preparedness, confining his answer to the Army.

Mr. SHERMAN. An Army of 200,000 regular soldiers.

Mr. WORKS. Does the Senator think that 200,000 soldiers would be adequate to defend the Pacific coast alone if we are going to prepare for actual war?

Mr. SHERMAN. Not on a war basis. Two hundred thousand, however, in time of peace, together with an adequate number of officers, would meet the requirements of a regular army.

Mr. WORKS. I am very glad to have the Senator's idea about what constitutes adequate preparedness.

Mr. SHERMAN. I may add, in order that I may not appear to be presumptuous, that my opinion is second handed. It is based upon gentlemen whom I regard as military experts. I realize that I am not a military or a naval expert either, and I shall take very largely the judgment of those who are. The men who in the event of defensive warfare would be required to use this instrument at the risk of their lives, and who would be required to prepare and execute a successful defense, and whose life training is in that line, I would be disposed to trust with preparation for such a crisis.

EFFORTS OF THE MINORITY.

Implied criticism, at least, was made not long ago of the minority in the Senate and in the House because we have not raised our voice in protest against these appropriations. When we have done so it is only to be defeated by a party vote, if a roll call were ever reached. The river and harbor bill was not long ago under discussion in this body. I was temporarily absent in 1914, engaged myself in a course of preparedness for defensive warfare. I was not here at that time to engage in that public duty. I thought it was more important to the people of my State that I should continue to represent them than even to respond to the duties of legislation.

I can remember that the river and harbor bill was defeated by an alleged reprehensible practice, something that has been under criticism since then. Many distinguished gentlemen who can write essays of magnificence and power to be published in various periodicals have told us what a reactionary body the Senate is. Some of the Members have gone so far as to say that the only thing that can rejuvenate this body and make it a fit representative of a free people is cloture. King Caucus will still stalk through the corridors of the Capitol, executive influence will dispense patronage with its insidious wiles and will continue to persuade gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber as of old, but cloture must be applied in order that the people may rule. What would have happened to the river and harbor bill, that is by courtesy and sometimes affectionately called a "pork-barrel" bill, if cloture had been the parliamentary rule of the Senate at that time?

The river and harbor bill, Mr. President, was defeated. It was inexcusable in its extravagant sums. It was defeated in this Chamber by the determined opposition of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] with the then senior Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton. It was called in vulgar parlance a filibuster, but it successfully filibustered more than \$30,000,000 out of the bill. You ought to rise on that side of the Chamber and call us blessed, instead of indulging in criticism, because we saved the deficit from being greater than it is. The gentlemen who are of my political affiliation on this side were doing picket duty, and saved the Treasury to the degree of \$30,000,000.

Only last winter there came from the Chief Executive advice and from the majority party, acting in caucus, a bill. I know it is disclaimed that there is any such thing as a caucus, Mr. President. It has been criticized like the open forum in the

Senate. Many gentlemen wrote against it. Few of them ever ran for office. It is a characteristic of some of the most prominent critics in the country that their chief function is to criticize people who do run for office and are sometimes successful in being elected. They then become a shining mark for the critics. The critic had, or thought he had, his way. He destroyed the caucus, and instead of the caucus we have now what is called more euphoniously a conference. Down beneath the sturdy vest of a conference beats the still sturdier heart of King Caucus, as of old. There is not any change in it except by name, and a rose by any other name would still possess the same flavor. It is the result, not the name, after all.

So out of that caucus came a Government shipping bill. Forty million dollars for the initial expenditures was contemplated. It is a good deal when the Treasury is depleted. It was presented and urged for passage in this body after passing the House. It was supported by the administration and by the caucus action of the majority. It was defeated in this body by the minority Senators, joined by a few of the majority, who declined to commit themselves or be committed by the administration to the unwise policy embodied in the measure. Over \$100,000,000 additional appropriation would have been taken from the Treasury if the minority side of the Chamber had not protested.

The President told us not very many months ago, when he was out in Indianapolis, just a year ago the 8th day of this month, on Jackson Day, that he was perfectly willing for us to talk as long as we did not hurt anybody. When the minority talked against the appropriations he criticized it and wishes a gag law in the Senate. We talked last winter and talked successfully.

When the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] implies that we assisted by our votes in such attempted appropriations he is in error. We accept the responsibility of defeating the legislation referred to or helping defeat it. Let it be remembered that when our voices were raised upon a roll call it was ineffective. The only way in which the shipping bill and the river and harbor bill could be beaten was by the much-condemned employment of a filibuster. I am always frank enough to say that it was a filibuster, intended as such, and for no reason under the sun except to defeat the legislation by mere lapse of time.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have just come into the Chamber. I do not think the Senator from Illinois means to say that the Senator from Alabama said that no Republican voice was raised against the appropriation in connection with the shipping bill. The Senator does not mean, I say, that the Senator from Alabama singled out that bill and said you did not protest against it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh, no; only you will find, by consulting the Record, that it was suggested if we by our votes assisted in enacting laws for the expenditure of money we were responsible. The intimation seemed to be we had helped the administration into its present troubles.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not hear all the Senator from Alabama said in his forceful and illuminating speech.

Mr. SHERMAN. I both heard it and read it. It invited perusal and examination.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am sure he did not say that, because the Senator will recall the fact that the shipping bill provided for issuing Panama Canal bonds for the purpose of building or purchasing ships under it.

Mr. SHERMAN. The substance of the impression was that the minority was responsible and that we were estopped from complaining about extravagant appropriations.

Mr. SIMMONS. I called attention only to one specific thing. I do not remember the declaration of the Senator from Alabama. Certainly the shipping bill could not have been included in the meaning of anything he said on that subject, because the bill did not appropriate money. It proposed to issue bonds.

The Senator, in claiming that the Republican Party is entitled to the credit, as he put it a little while ago, of the defeat of the river and harbor bill, is, I think, far afield from the facts. It is true, as the Senator says, that that measure was filibustered to death by the activities, largely, of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the then Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton, and a few others. But outside of a few Republican Senators and probably a few Democratic Senators, if we had come to a vote upon that bill, my understanding is that it would have received a majority of the votes of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber. I recall the fact that during the consideration of that measure, after the filibuster had continued for some time, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE],

recognized as one of the leaders on the other side of the Chamber, rose in his seat and expressed the earnest and sincere hope that the effort to defeat the bill would not succeed, and he pledged assistance from the other side of the Chamber in the passage of the bill.

Of course, I can not tell, and no one ever can tell how many Republicans would have supported that bill if we had taken the vote, but from my knowledge of the Senators on the other side—and I had something to do with that bill, I was on the Committee on Commerce which reported the bill, and anxious for its passage, and was in constant conference with Senators on both sides of the Chamber—it was my belief that a large majority of the Senators on the other side, probably as large a majority of the Senators on the other side as on this side of the Chamber—no, I will not say that, but a large majority of Senators on the other side, in my judgment, were in favor of that bill. The Republican Party, therefore, are not entitled to the credit, if there is any credit due to anybody, for its defeat. I do not think there is any credit due to anybody for its defeat, but if there is, certainly it is not due to the Republican Party, but to a few members of that party who prevented it from coming to a vote by filibustering.

Mr. SHERMAN. At any rate, Mr. President, the bill in question came out with a favorable committee report and it reached in the Senate the parliamentary stage of legislation where nothing but a roll call intervened between it and the Treasury. At that point it hit the obstacles that finally led to its undoing, and as I understand, if I am correct in my reading of the Record, finally, at the end of a prolonged discussion, it was agreed between the friends of the bill and those opposed to it that something like thirty or thirty-three million dollars should be cut off, and it went through finally for \$20,000,000 instead of the original amount of \$53,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is right in saying that a compromise bill was passed; but the Senator has just referred to the fact that there was a report upon the bill. Of course there was, as there is a report on every appropriation bill that comes to the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. Was it a favorable report?

Mr. SIMMONS. That is exactly what I was going to say. There was a report from the Committee on Commerce upon that bill, and I think, if the Senator will get the report and read it, he will find that it was a unanimously favorable report. That committee was composed of Democrats and Republicans; I think there was a Democratic majority of only two; among the Republican Members were some of the leading Senators on that side of the Chamber. That bill came out of the committee without a dissenting vote, so far as I now recall.

Mr. SHERMAN. At any rate, it came out, and whatever may have been the conditions when it was in the committee, it emerged from the committee and got into trouble, which ultimately lost the greater part of the appropriation. It is a matter of record that Senators on the minority side of the Chamber successfully raised their voices, even if they were joined by those on the majority side of the Chamber. It is a part of the credit to which minority Senators are entitled for blocking that much of the appropriation.

It is worthy of note here, Mr. President, that if a Senate closure rule had been in force at that time there would have been something over \$30,000,000 additional in the river and harbor bill, burdening the Treasury at this time, requiring either a bond issue of \$40,000,000 under the authority to issue Panama Canal bonds, or there would have been that appropriation out of the current receipts of the Treasury. I do not go on the idea that because we issue bonds we thereby never have anything to pay. The misfortune is when I have signed anything or issued any obligation of mine, that pay day always arrives. I never in my life had a check lost; I never signed a promissory note that it did not turn up in some quarter of the globe demanding payment. If we issue bonds we only defer the day of payment, and at some time the taxpayers, at some time the Treasury, is called on to meet the bond when it matures. So it does not make any difference whether it be a bond issue or whether it be paid out of current receipts, it still calls upon the taxing resources of the country to meet it.

I think, in view of these authenticated records, that instead of the censorious shifting of responsibility it ought to be acknowledged that a minority saved the country from further financial ills you sought to inflict on it.

NATIONAL RECEIPTS.

No war disturbed the world in our fiscal year 1914. It was for import and revenue purposes a peace year for us. When war came in August it was unexpected in every market and exchange in this country. The German Army crossed the Bel-

gian frontier on the 3d day of August, 1914. Before that time imports and exports had pursued the usual channels of peaceful merchandise. Imports increased nearly \$81,000,000 over the preceding year of 1913. Democratic tariff rates, however, produced but \$237,320,015. The universal excuse for the present condition of Government finances is the decrease of imports and consequent loss of customs for the fiscal year of 1915. If the entire receipts of the Government for the year 1915 be assembled for purposes of comparison with 1914 it will shed light on Democratic finances.

Customs receipts.....	\$209,786,672.21
Internal revenue, ordinary.....	283,398,760.85
Corporation income tax.....	39,155,596.77
Individual income tax.....	41,046,162.09
Land sales.....	2,167,136.47
Miscellaneous.....	70,287,372.90
Total.....	697,910,827.58

The foregoing includes the total receipts of the Government except that from postal savings bonds, bank-note redemption fund, and postal revenues—being \$933,540, \$21,553,415, and \$287,248,165.27, respectively—and are not material in the analysis of the revenue-producing quality of the 1913 tariff act.

The customs receipts of 1915 are the lowest since 1890. Our total imports in 1890 were \$697,148,489, as against imports in 1915 of \$1,674,169,740. In 1890, 56.93 per cent of our imports were dutiable, as against 38.30 per cent in 1915. Customs receipts in 1890 were \$206,128,482. With less than 42 per cent of the imports of 1915 there was collected within \$3,658,190 of customs in 1890 as in 1915 with nearly two and one-half times the imports in 1915 as in 1890.

It is instructive to marshal the customs receipts alone of the peace year of 1914 with the internal revenue, corporation and income tax, and other receipts of 1915, excluding the customs receipts of the latter year. The customs receipts from July 1, 1913, to June 30, 1914, excluding \$55,000,000 derived from Republican rates in excess of that produced by Democratic rates and \$3,800,000 surplus postal revenues, are \$237,320,015; ordinary internal revenue, 1915, \$283,398,760.85; corporation income tax, 1915, \$39,155,596.77; individual income tax, 1915, \$41,046,162.09; emergency revenue act, October 22, 1914, \$52,069,126.29. Total, \$652,989,661. If the emergency revenue receipts be deducted from the total of the last table, it would leave \$600,920,534.71. This omits miscellaneous receipts, land sales, and items of receipts not directly affected by tariff legislation. It is apparent from the foregoing that if the revenue from customs receipts in the peace year of 1914 were added to the ordinary internal-revenue receipts, corporation-income tax, and individual-income tax of 1915, it would still fall far short of enough to meet the expenses of the Government. This deficit was sought to be filled by the emergency tax of October 22, 1914. It, too, proved inadequate to stay the dwindling revenues. This demonstrates conclusively that if the world were at peace Democratic finances would inevitably empty the Treasury. Coupled with the foregoing decrease in revenues is the tremendous increase in appropriations of the Sixty-third Congress over the last Congress controlled by Republicans already alluded to.

The decrease in tariff rates is directly responsible for inadequate revenues. It is capable of proof. There was collected from customs in 1915, \$209,786,672.21. This, compared with the customs receipts of 1914 of \$292,320,015, shows a loss of customs of \$82,533,342. This is habitually charged to the reduced imports resulting from the European war. The revenue-producing power of the Democratic tariff act of 1913 is capable of proof to demonstrate this fallacy.

The total dutiable imports of the war year of 1915 are \$640,643,065. It must be borne in mind that the remainder of the \$1,674,000,000 for this year passed through our custom-houses duty free. The dutiable imports, therefore, raised the whole of the \$209,268,109 customs receipts. This is an average ad valorem of 32.66 per cent. The dutiable imports of the peace year of 1914 were \$766,422,958. If the average ad valorem 32.66 per cent rate of duty were applied to the total dutiable imports of the peace year of 1914, it would produce in customs duties \$250,313,738.08. This would be the most favorable condition under which these normal revenues would be produced, making total ordinary receipts of 1915, excluding emergency tax:

Customs receipts.....	\$250,313,738.08
Ordinary internal revenue, 1915.....	283,398,760.85
Corporation income tax, 1915.....	39,155,596.77
Individual income tax.....	41,046,162.09
Sales, public land.....	2,167,136.47
Miscellaneous.....	70,287,372.90

Total ordinary income, including what would have been derived from the dutiable imports of 1914 on the 1915 rates of customs..... 686,368,767.16

Government expenses in 1915 are:

Civil establishment	\$207,169,824.05
War Department	172,973,091.73
Naval Establishment	141,835,653.98
Indian Service	21,130,350.70
Pensions	164,387,941.61
Interest, public debt	22,902,897.04
Panama Canal disbursement	29,187,042.22
Bank-note redemptions	17,205,958.00
Miscellaneous redemptions	47,533.00

Making a total disbursement, exclusive of Post Office Department	777,840,292.33
Leaving an excess of disbursements over receipts of	91,471,525.17

The estimates of the revenues of 1915 omit the emergency tax of October 22, 1914. Receipts under this act were, in 1915, \$52,069,126.29; which, deducted, still leaves a deficit of \$39,420,398.88.

The foregoing tables show that the tariff act of 1913 would not under peaceable conditions, even supported by the emergency revenue act, have supplied enough funds to meet the appropriations of the Democratic Congress. The responsible authors of the Democratic tariff revision avowed that its rates were deliberately framed to decrease customs receipts. The increased imports of 1914 were a natural result of this act. It is now sought to evade its natural consequences. A comparison of the free imports for periods covering Republican rates and Democratic rates is instructive.

	Per cent.
Year ending June 30, 1911, imports free of duty	50.87
Year ending June 30, 1914, imports free of duty	59.54
Year ending June 30, 1915, imports free of duty	61.70
Month of July, 1915, imports free of duty	62.53
Month of August, 1915, imports free of duty	63.14
Month of September, 1915, imports free of duty	64.12
Month of October, 1915, imports free of duty	70.91
Average ad valorem duties, 1911	41.22
Average ad valorem duties, 1914	37.60
Average ad valorem duties, 1915	32.66
The average ad valorem rate on free and dutiable imports for the year ending June 30, 1915, was	12.50

This average rate applied to the \$270,000,000 estimated customs receipts in 1914 by the House and Senate committees reporting this measure would have required imports of \$2,160,000,000 in 1915. To produce the revenues derived from the customs receipts of 1914 it would have required an increase of imports to \$2,338,560,000. To have produced these revenues would have created such a flood of imports under normal conditions as would have invaded this market in time of peace, and would have produced the normal results we began to feel before the outbreak of the war.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do.

Mr. SIMMONS. What did the Senator say was the increase in the imports during the fiscal year 1915?

Mr. SHERMAN. The increase in imports that year, which I have used here, was reached by taking the estimated revenues from the customs of \$270,000,000, and, with that as the basis, taking the average ad valorem rate on dutiable goods.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator has misunderstood me. I asked him what he had stated was the increase in the imports from June, 1913, to June, 1914?

Mr. SHERMAN. It was \$81,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator says that in order for us to get anything like an adequate revenue from the customs taxes it would require an importation of goods to the amount of \$2,100,000,000. I want to ask the Senator how he reconciles that statement with the fact that in the fiscal year from June 30, 1913, to June 30, 1914, there was only an increase of about \$81,000,000 in imports into this country in the face of the fact that customs duties collected from those imports in that year were \$292,000,000, compared with \$318,000,000 collected in the previous year.

Mr. SHERMAN. The figures just quoted are for the year ending June 30, 1914.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; I understand they are for the year 1914. With an increase in importations in that year of only \$81,000,000 we collected in customs duties \$292,000,000, as compared with \$318,000,000 collected in the preceding year, when the Payne-Aldrich tariff law was in force.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; I can explain that.

Mr. SIMMONS. A difference of just about \$28,000,000; that is, with an importation of only \$81,000,000 in excess of the previous year we collected within \$28,000,000 of the amount of customs revenue collected in that year.

Mr. SHERMAN. First, Mr. President, the \$292,000,000 of customs duties in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, were not collected under the act of 1913. The duties collected under that act fall \$55,000,000 short of that amount. The Senator is assuming

the credit for revenue not collected under the law; he is borrowing the fruits of previous Republican legislation. It is an assumption on the floor here that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, the tariff act of 1913 produced \$292,000,000 of revenue.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if the Senator makes that point, then we will start at October, 1913, when the present law became effective. From October, 1913, to August 1, 1914, when the war began, we collected under the present tariff law \$306,000,000, whereas the revenues from October 1, 1912, to August 1, 1913, were \$295,000,000. So that during that period of about 10 months before the war began there was collected under the present law, when it was in full operation, except as to the taxes on wool, over \$10,000,000 more than was collected during the preceding year. That statement includes the amount collected under all the provisions of the law, not only from customs duties but under the corporation and individual income-tax provisions.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator quote the customs duties alone in the figures he gives?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not in the last statement, but I did in the first statement.

Mr. SHERMAN. In the latter statement the Senator does not include customs duties alone?

Mr. SIMMONS. Not the customs duties alone, but the customs duties with the amount from the income-tax provisions.

Mr. SHERMAN. The figures for the corporation tax and the individual income tax were included, then, in the last statement?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. That does not apply so strongly in answer to the argument of the Senator as the results from the operation of the tariff provisions alone of the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand.

Mr. SIMMONS. The customs receipts under the present law during the first year of its operation amounted to within \$28,000,000 of the receipts from customs duties during the preceding year, when the Payne-Aldrich bill was in force, while the imports increased only \$81,000,000 over the previous year.

If the conditions shall ever be as they were before the war, does not the Senator believe, from that showing, that with a reasonable increase in imports—and we contemplated and intended that there should be an increase in imports—the present law will yield enough revenue to respond to the needs of the Government in normal times without any resort to other means of revenue?

Mr. SHERMAN. On the figures the Senator has cited he would have to have at least twice the amount of imports in order to collect the required amount of customs duties, because the average rate is so very greatly reduced that it could only be compensated for by a very large increase in the volume of imports.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the Senator said that we had an increase of \$81,000,000 in imports, and yet there was only a falling off of \$28,000,000 in the receipts from customs duties.

Mr. SHERMAN. I had not completed the reply. First, Mr. President, the Senator himself voted for the act in 1913, and was entirely consistent in doing so, with the reasons he presented both as chairman of the committee and otherwise. The revenues, according to the figures quoted by the Senator from the report of the Department of Commerce, can be readily accounted for. The duty on sugar for the last four or five years has yielded about \$52,000,000 a year, except last year, when it yielded \$49,282,113; that is, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915.

During the months the receipts for which were read by the Senator there was an average of \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 every month derived from the duty on sugar. The Senator does not believe in making sugar dutiable. He thinks the ultimate consumer's interests demands that sugar be free listed. The high cost of living was to be thereby reduced.

Since it goes into every home, everybody is interested in having removed the tariff, which is a tax, according to the economic school in which the Senator believes. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, therefore, Mr. President, more than \$49,000,000, even under the reduced duties on sugar provided in the act of 1913, were collected from sugar alone. That, too, is another spurious virtue assumed as being incident to the act of 1913. It is borrowed strength; it is a source of revenue that is deliberately filched from Republican legislation. If the Senator would deduct the sugar duties from the receipts he has cited, he would find no such pleasing assurance as he derives from the figures which he has quoted.

The actual imports in 1914 were \$1,894,000,000. If imports had increased so as to produce the estimated receipts or the actual receipts in the peace year applied to 1915, our imports would have increased between \$400,000,000 and \$500,000,000. This immense flood of merchandise which would have entered our mar-

kets is what was averted by the war conditions that prevailed in the principal producing and distributing centers of Europe. The industrial depression that existed when the belligerent nations entered our markets for munitions of war was a forerunner of the natural results of the Democratic tariff revision of 1913. The estimates I have given indicate the menace of a 70 per cent free-trade act when peace is concluded.

At some time a treaty of peace will be signed; victor and vanquished will appear; all human events end. There never has been a war waged on earth that at some time did not conclude; and when the present war shall cease, Mr. President, there will be a necessity for economic preparedness here to defend from peril the great manufacturing centers, the great grain-producing areas of the Northwest, and the great livestock interests of this country, a preparedness second only to that for military and naval defense.

A GROWING DEFICIT.

The competitive tariff for which such a glowing future was predicted in 1913 will resume its operations when the war is over. A Treasury deficit is the least of the sins charged to this measure. I do not believe in times of peace, with from 60 to 70 per cent imports free listed, as they are, it would produce enough customs revenues under existing laws to equal the expenditures of this administration unless supplemented by additional direct taxation.

On July 1, 1914, the world was at peace. Our imports had not been affected by war. It is indisputable, however, that Government revenues had already diminished. Our expenditures had increased steadily under the appropriations of a Democratic Congress. The natural tendency of decreased receipts and increased appropriations was becoming manifest. The general balance in the Treasury June 30, 1913, according to the same reports from which the Senator from North Carolina quotes, was \$166,000,000. By June 30, 1915—last summer only—it had fallen to \$104,000,000. That, too, in the face of a statement in the House that appropriations have been less than for preceding years, and the statement in this Senate that our receipts have been greater during that time.

In the face of that, the general balance in the Treasury shows a shrinkage of more than \$62,000,000. This decrease in the Treasury resources was in spite of the emergency tax of October 22, 1914, intended to supply the additional revenue required. That act produced up to the 30th day of last June \$52,000,000, and in the four months since that time about \$27,000,000. In the aggregate the actual annual receipts from the emergency tax are about \$80,000,000.

Those two sources of revenue—the emergency tax of October, 1914, and the corporation and individual income tax of the act of 1913—make about \$132,000,000 of increased revenue; and still, with this increased revenue, the shrinkage in customs duties has been such as to create a shrinkage in the general balance of the Treasury, such as to show each month, as the summary comes out from the Department of Commerce, an excess of expenditures over receipts, except a few months—some two or three, I think—since the 4th day of March, 1913.

Miscellaneous receipts in 1915 were \$70,000,000. It runs generally from \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000, \$58,000,000, and \$60,000,000—rarely over \$60,000,000. We can not flatter ourselves that miscellaneous receipts will be \$70,000,000 unless we sell two more battleships, as we did, the proceeds going into the Treasury in 1915.

NEED OF MORE REVENUE.

Supplemental revenue is still indispensable to the continued solvency of the Treasury. The Republicans believe in increasing receipts from customs by increasing the duties. If that were done, with a readjustment of the income tax, as suggested, by increasing the supertax instead of lowering the exemption to reach the living line, enough revenue would be produced to meet necessary expenses and appropriations for proper military and naval forces sufficient for defensive purposes.

The President in his message estimates that \$93,800,000 additional revenue will be required to carry out our military and naval preparations, and he and the department recommend that such additional revenues be produced by new legislation. Bonds are condemned. He sums up the situation in the conclusion that all told about \$112,000,000 of new revenue will be required annually, provided all existing sources of revenue now in force shall be retained. That would retain the present duty on sugar of \$1. It would retain the emergency revenue tax of something like \$79,000,000 or \$80,000,000 a year. It would retain every source of revenue that exists at this time.

I favor the duty on sugar. I would vote readily to increase it to \$1.35, or even higher, for two reasons: First, I believe the cane-sugar growers are entitled to it. They have had it from time immemorial. I believe the beet-sugar producers are en-

titled to it. Because of that, if it be made a source of additional revenue, no objection will be heard from those on this side of the Chamber, very likely. I can speak only for myself, however, on that point.

It is to procure this additional revenue that taxes on gasoline, automobiles, bank checks, iron, and steel, and the like, are proposed.

Iron and steel and bank checks and automobiles by the horsepower—to be paid by the manufacturer, it is true—are all to be included in the list. The manufacturer will pass it along until the purchaser finally will pay it. That is the usual course of business. In the emergency act of October, 1914, a tax of 1 cent was imposed on telegraph messages, on telephone messages above 15 cents, on bills of lading, and the like. Who pays it? The carrier does not. The telegraph and telephone company does not. It is paid by the user of the facility for the communication of intelligence or for the transportation of merchandise. It is passed on to the general public.

If necessities are to be taxed, if iron and steel are to be taxed, if everything from a coal hod to a locomotive is to be taxed, I wish the President would get his horizon high enough to suggest a tax of about 50 cents a bale on cotton. That would produce seven or eight million dollars. The annual crop is about 14,000,000 bales. Of course, that would be passed on to the ultimate consumer, too, like everything else, but it is no worse in the one case than it is in the other.

The evident purpose, though, in all this taxation, is to levy a greater part of the burden upon a certain part of the country. I should like to have the populous States understand—populous in point of people and great in resources of banking, manufacturing, and transportation lines, agriculture and live stock—that those States are now paying three-fourths of the burden of supporting the Government; and the method proposed in the President's message increases this injustice.

If the tariff be regarded as a tax, as some gentlemen argue, it ought to have diminished the cost of living when a 70 per cent free-trade list became operative. No greater delusion ever seized upon the human mind. It is refuted by the figures of a hundred years. It is refuted by the figures of the last four years, especially since 1913. When sugar was reduced there was no material change in the price. There was a temporary reduction for two months of the summer of 1914, and after that a rise that has continued up to the present time. Nobody, outside of the solidly Democratic States and the authors of books gone mad with excessive and undigested learning, ever believed in the soundness of such a theory applied in the actual affairs of government.

NEW PROPOSITIONS.

In addition to this \$112,000,000 of new revenue, other appropriations are threatened. We learn from the head of the administration here that another shipping bill is to be urged upon the Sixty-fourth Congress at this and subsequent sessions. The Government, it is insisted, must undertake this task, with the consequent financial risk; and after it is well on its feet as a going concern the Government is to retire and turn it over to private enterprise.

For my part, while I come from a western country where there is not much sentiment for subsidies, you may call it what you will, but I would rather at any time vote for liberal contracts for carrying the mails overseas in American registered, sailed, and operated ships, in order to recreate merchant shipping, than embark upon the scheme of Government ownership and operation. The continually recurring reports that our expenditures exceed our receipts are ominous.

There is a treaty pending before this body that sometime we may be asked to ratify. It proposes to pay Colombia \$25,000,000 to repair her lost chance to loot the United States and delay the construction of the canal. Another treaty contemplates spending \$3,000,000 on a Nicaragua canal route that will have more navigation and fewer slides than the one we have. I have noted the somewhat aggressive and determined spirit among the friends of river and harbor appropriations in this Congress. The sum to be appropriated is uncertain, but I am sure considerable vigilance will be required to keep it within proper bounds. The Government will be called upon to provide for the development of good roads throughout the country. Bills have made their appearance appropriating different sums for that purpose. We have undertaken to build a railroad in Alaska. The initial appropriation is a constantly recurring charge on the Treasury until the road shall have been completed or the appropriation exhausted.

The Navy Department is asking for additional sums mentioned in the President's annual message, as well as the War Department. These estimates are the basis of appropriations. It is especially significant now, when our revenues are con-

stantly decreasing, that such large sums are under consideration. It indicates that the utmost economy is required; that the economy plank of the platform of 1912, adopted at Baltimore, must not be an idle declaration, but it must be made effective if we are to have money enough to meet the charges necessary for military and naval preparation.

Direct taxes are resorted to. That is necessary where customs duties are abandoned as the principal source of revenue.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

It ought not to be forgotten in this financial discussion that the Panama Canal was built under the revenues and financial legislation of preceding years and not that of 1913. A comparatively small bond issue was made under legislation that authorized a total of \$375,000,000. The greater part of the canal expense was defrayed from current revenues produced under a protective tariff. Customs duties constituted, under that legislation, one-half of our total receipts. At the close of the year ending June 30, 1916, after all the appropriations for the canal shall have been paid, this Government will have expended more than \$402,000,000 in its construction. Of this total cost \$66,000,000 has been expended under appropriations since this administration came into power, paid out of the current receipts of the Treasury. If \$66,000,000 be deducted for the years 1914, 1915, and 1916, there remains a total of \$336,000,000 paid during previous years.

The total proceeds of bonds sold was \$138,000,000. Nearly \$200,000,000 remains as the sum paid out of the Treasury, supplied by the fiscal legislation of the party in power before March 4, 1913. Nearly \$200,000,000 paid out of current receipts for the construction of the canal is the record of the revenue-producing qualities of the laws that preceded the tariff revision of 1913. If the proportional part of this nearly \$200,000,000 burden during this administration had fallen upon its dwindling resources, it would have made a much more striking exhibit of its financial failure.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMMONS. It just occurred to me to ask the Senator, if the facts are as he states them, why it was necessary for his party to issue any of these bonds for the purpose of paying for the construction of the Panama Canal. I believe that the only bonds that have ever been issued under that act have been issued by the Republican Party during the administrations of President Roosevelt and President Taft; and I believe the total amount of those bonds issued during these Republican administrations was \$138,000,000.

If the ordinary revenues under those administrations and during the years when these bonds were issued were sufficient and more than sufficient to meet the current expenses of the Government, and left the big surpluses in the Treasury which the Senator is talking about, why did they issue those bonds, a part of them during Taft's administration and a part of them during Roosevelt's administration?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have just stated, as the Senator will recall, if he has been following the course of the figures, that nearly \$200,000,000 have already been paid out of current receipts in previous years—that is, prior to 1914, 1915, and 1916—nearly \$200,000,000 during the revenue-producing period of the fiscal legislation of Republican administrations. One hundred and thirty-eight million dollars have been derived from bond issues. If the nearly \$200,000,000 of current receipts paid out on this account had been added to the \$138,000,000, it would have been burdening—to use the language of some of our Democratic friends—the present generation to pay the entire cost of this great improvement. The present generation paid \$200,000,000. If \$200,000,000, or the proportional part of it, had been paid out of the receipts of this administration, there would have been a gathering of the clans that has not been equaled since the 4th of March, 1913, because there would be not only a deficit but a public indebtedness, or the construction work on the canal would have stopped. The \$138,000,000 of bonds was issued that future generations of taxpayers might pay their just share.

Mr. SIMMONS. But I will ask the Senator if that was the reason why they issued only \$138,000,000 of bonds? Why did they not, by the same token, issue bonds for the Panama expenditures during these administrations?

Mr. SHERMAN. Why, if you had done that, does not the Senator know—

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I want to ask the Senator if he does not know the fact that when these bonds were issued there was a shortage in the current funds to pay current expenditures?

Does the Senator mean to tell the Senate and the country seriously that the \$138,000,000 of bonds which his party issued

for the construction of the Panama Canal was deliberately issued for the sole and exclusive purpose of passing that burden on to future generations and not because of the condition of the Treasury?

Mr. SHERMAN. No; that was not the sole purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. And that after his party had followed that course for some little time it suddenly changed its mind and concluded that it would no longer put this burden upon future generations, but would pay it out of the current revenues of the Government?

Mr. SHERMAN. That was not the sole reason, Mr. President.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator says that his party, in addition to the amount derived from these bonds, paid \$223,000,000 toward the construction of the canal. That was not a very large sum per annum, if we consider the number of years that that great work was under construction during the administrations of his party. The Democrats have been in power about three years, and we have paid every dollar of that expense—I do not remember the exact figures now, but something like \$30,000,000 per annum—out of the current revenues. Up to this time we have not issued a single bond for that purpose.

The question which I want to get the Senator to answer is this: Does he mean to tell the country that these \$138,000,000 of bonds were issued by his party, not because of a deficit in the Treasury, not because of the condition of the finances of the Government, but for the purpose of passing this burden on to future generations? That is what I understood him to say.

Mr. SHERMAN. That was not the sole motive.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought it was an inadvertent statement when I heard the Senator make it.

Mr. SHERMAN. The statement was not inadvertent but was unfinished when the Senator asked his question. The Republican Party is a party of long experience and great foresight, Mr. President. It was not born yesterday; and, notwithstanding the mutations of fortune, it will survive, in my judgment, for many years. Pursuant to that foresight it not only had the motive of passing on a portion of this indebtedness to future generations that would receive the benefits of the canal when in operation, but it had another motive.

By the way, not \$138,000,000 of bonds were issued, but \$134,000,000, in round figures. The balance was the premium collected on the bond issue, paid by the investor. It is noticeable that it is very seldom that a premium is paid on public securities at so low a rate of interest, and it is an additional evidence of the soundness of the finances of preceding administrations that that premium could be collected on the sale of these securities.

But there is an additional reason, based upon the foresight of the party then in power. It does not lie in the attitude taken by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance to complain of a \$134,000,000 bond issue for the purpose named. He is the last person in the world authorized to complain of it. There were \$166,000,000 left in the general balance of the Treasury on the 30th day of June, 1913. That was a surplus brought over from preceding Republican administrations. I ask my distinguished friend from North Carolina, if it had not been for that surplus afforded by a Republican administration where would the Senator and his party be except in the deep morasses of financial imbecility and failure? You ought to thank your good fortune that a party preceded you that had some financial economy and sense instead of posing here in a spirit of censorious criticism because we left you a surplus to squander.

UNJUST TAX BURDENS.

The responsibility for the unjust distribution of the revenues now collected so as to place their burdens disproportionately upon certain sections of the country, if continued or increased, ought to be fixed and known. I have prepared certain tables, Mr. President, that I will insert here without reading. I ask to have them printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that course may be taken.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Corporation and individual income tax collected for fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

California	\$2,860,751	Alabama	\$261,760
Connecticut	1,283,695	Arizona	126,559
Illinois	5,654,151	Arkansas	127,326
Iowa	733,488	Florida	229,509
Massachusetts	4,536,141	Georgia	440,600
Michigan	2,913,307	Louisiana	526,177
Minnesota	2,033,523	Mississippi	108,180
New Jersey	2,673,267	North Carolina	381,078
New York	27,638,743	South Carolina	161,401
Ohio	4,027,459	Texas	1,048,277
Pennsylvania	9,367,696	Tennessee	410,209
Rhode Island	711,111	Oklahoma	406,888
Wisconsin	875,352	Virginia	627,938
Total	65,308,684	Total	4,855,902

Mr. SHERMAN. These tables show that the attempt by a graduated income tax to cast the burden on the general wealth of the country has failed. It was stated here upon several occasions in 1913, and has been repeated at this session of the Sixty-fourth Congress, that the purpose in reducing customs revenues was to throw the burden of taxation upon the wealth of the country that was escaping a just proportion of taxation under former revenue measures. In this particular form it has classified property and levies the tax upon certain classes of property and exempts others.

It may be said of the newer States that wealth is more evenly distributed among many hands, resulting in fewer large holdings. A large proportion of the property of some of the States showing a large total wealth is farms, their equipment, and live stock. Incomes from such property in a large number of holdings fall below the \$3,000 and \$4,000 exemptions. In the older-settled States, such as Louisiana, the Middle West, and some of the North Atlantic States property has assumed different forms. Much of it is in corporations engaged in various undertakings, industrial and otherwise. It makes no difference how widely scattered their shares are, the corporation itself is subject to tax. To that degree it diminishes the earnings finally distributed to the shareholders, without regard to the size of the holdings.

The whole theory on which an income tax is framed is that the large incomes are able to pay, while those that run near the living line are not. The exemptions have excluded from the operations of the tax a great body of farmers of the country, wage earners, skilled labor of all kinds, and the employees in offices, mills, transportation companies, and elsewhere whose salaries fall within the exemption. They constitute the great body of active men and women throughout the country who are engaged in the necessary service incident to gainful occupations.

The exemption of this large multitude is not made on the principle of equality of taxation. It is based entirely upon the ability of the persons with incomes above \$3,000 and \$4,000 to pay. This is further emphasized by the supertax on incomes, exceeding \$20,000. This creates yet a third classification, on the idea that after this larger income has been reached that more can be exacted by the Government without impairing the support of the taxpayer or those dependent on him.

The proposal to increase the rates of taxation on individual and corporation incomes is made by the Secretary of the Treasury. The exemptions of \$3,000 for single and \$4,000 for married persons, it is suggested, could be reduced to \$2,000 and \$3,000, respectively, without hardship. The supertax, it is further intimated, could begin at \$10,000 or \$15,000 instead of \$20,000 as provided by the present law.

I am opposed to lowering the exemption below the \$3,000 and \$4,000 limit. I believe it would impose burdens on a large multitude engaged in various forms of active service. If the question of equality of taxation were the controlling motive of this form of tax the exemption could be removed entirely. But the ability to pay and not the possession of the income is the motive of the law. Many employees engaged in many lines of service would be taxed on a \$2,000 or \$3,000 limit. This proposition reaches the bread line or the income required for living necessities. It threatens a tax on earning capacity.

There were 357,515 returns made for the fiscal year of 1915. The normal tax is assessed between the \$3,000 and \$4,000 exemption line up to \$20,000 income. Beyond the \$20,000 income the supertax is imposed. Three hundred and twenty-six thousand six hundred and fifty-eight persons out of 357,515 making returns paid the normal tax. The supertax was paid by only 30,857 persons in the United States. The total individual income tax collected for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, was \$41,046,162.09. Of this, \$16,559,492.93 was a normal tax by the 326,658 persons. The remaining \$24,486,669.16 was paid by the 30,857 persons subject to the supertax, or additional tax, as it is known in section 2 of the tariff act of 1913.

Reduced to percentages, 43 per cent of the individual income tax is normal and 57 per cent is the supertax, or "additional tax," levied upon incomes in excess of \$20,000.

The proposition to lower the exemption below the \$3,000 and \$4,000 income would necessarily reach out and grasp in its operation a great multitude of persons who are living upon their earning capacity and not upon fixed investments or very large compensations for extraordinary services. It would reach a large multitude—the locomotive engineer, the farmer, the man in the railroad shop, those engaged in many of the transportation undertakings of the country. A vast number who are the living agents by which the great industrial mechanism of the country is kept in operation will be taxed when this exemption is lowered.

INHERITANCE TAX SUGGESTED.

Revenue must be had. I anticipate it will be a difference only in the source of revenue and the methods of collection. Great Britain derives more than \$125,000,000 a year from inheritance taxes. Her total wealth is estimated to be about \$85,000,000,000. She is an Empire with a central authority, governed by Parliament. No States or Provinces, with their exclusive local laws, apply many sources of revenue. Our States are different. They have certain rights not granted away. Among them are the laws of descent and the statute of wills. The property is taxed under the local laws of the State. They stand, therefore, at the gateway, and in the first instance are entitled to levy the inheritance tax or death rate.

Ordinarily I am opposed to the Government taking the inheritance tax as a source of revenue away from the States. The wealth of this country is over \$187,000,000,000. It is constantly passing by inheritance or will. It is a proper subject for excise taxation. The smaller estates can be exempted, so that we can follow the spirit in which the income-tax law was framed.

It ought generally to be reserved to the several States as a source of revenue. Many States collect considerable sums from this source already. The largest States and some of the smaller ones collect it and have for some years. In some places the income from that source runs up considerably in excess of \$1,000,000 annually, and in the larger three or four States it is likely to be much in excess of that sum.

On ordinary occasions the States ought to have reserved death rates as a source of State revenue. It may be admitted, though, that this is not an ordinary occasion. The only ordinary thing about the condition we are in now is that usually an administration of the party now in power always produces a deficit instead of a surplus. It is ordinary in that sense, but extraordinary in its necessity.

A strenuous effort is made to discover new sources of revenue. I am in favor of dividing the revenue from inheritance taxes equally between the Government and the State in which it is collected. This plan would raise a sum that is difficult correctly to estimate at this time, but from fifty to seventy-five million dollars could be paid without imposing serious burdens upon heirs or devisees or legatees taking the property. Our total wealth is more than double Great Britain's. It is fair to say we could collect more death rates than she does.

The proposal to tax gasoline and bank checks and a great variety of products of iron and steel is a tax at last to be paid by the user of the article. The opinion seems to prevail in some quarters that gasoline is a luxury; that comes from habitual residence in cities. If a gentleman was out in the Northwest country, the great grain-producing area, in the great industrial centers, the dairy regions, he would find that gasoline is as much a necessity as a horse or a mule in other sections. It is a different form of power, and a proposal to tax gasoline so much per gallon is a tax upon the source of mechanical power in nearly every farming community in the country.

These are direct taxes, and it is an unfair distribution. Why should one occupation pay \$10,000 a year and somebody carrying on another kind of business handling a different article of merchandise pay \$5 or \$20 a year?

The idea that tooth powder and tooth paste is now to be taxed as a luxury approaches, as a sober business matter, the realms of the sublimely ridiculous. It might have done in the time of the cave men, but I go on the presumption that even Members of Congress are entitled to brush their teeth without paying tribute to a war tax.

SECTIONAL LAWS.

The grossly unfair distribution of such tax burdens throughout the country is shown by the following tables of collections under Schedules A and B of the emergency-tax act of October 22, 1914, and described as No. 1 and No. 2:

Schedule A (No. 1).

California	\$826,760.18
Illinois	2,292,855.98
Indiana	374,006.19
Iowa	576,179.22
Massachusetts	915,431.60
Michigan	485,712.68
Minnesota	665,773.63
Missouri	858,628.73
New York	5,131,040.10
Ohio	849,996.36
Pennsylvania	1,523,038.68
Wisconsin	385,961.93
Total	14,885,345.27
Out of a total of \$20,494,474.75.	

Schedule B (No. 2).

California	\$90,858.88
Illinois	573,121.87
Indiana	29,409.38
Iowa	38,122.36

Massachusetts.....	\$128,903.90
Michigan.....	81,535.98
Minnesota.....	38,995.61
Missouri.....	119,164.84
New York.....	900,688.03
Ohio.....	160,236.28
Pennsylvania.....	119,510.83
Wisconsin.....	36,463.94
Total.....	2,317,011.90

Out of a total of \$2,961,490.59.

Nearly \$15,000,000 out of a total of a little over \$20,000,000 in A are paid by 12 States, while the same 12 States pay \$2,317,011.90 out of a total of \$2,961,490.59 collected under Schedule B. The burden falls unjustly upon a few occupations, upon a few States, and upon a few people.

Direct taxation falls on the property and the earning capacity of the country finally, whatever may be said to the contrary. Republican government obtains its power from the people of the country.

I wish to use the following tables, described as No. 3 and No. 4:

TABLE No. 3.

States.	Population 1910.	Votes 1912.
California.....	2,377,549	673,527
Connecticut.....	1,114,756	190,398
Illinois.....	5,638,591	1,146,173
Indiana.....	2,700,876	654,471
Massachusetts.....	3,366,416	488,056
Michigan.....	2,810,173	550,976
Minnesota.....	2,075,708	334,219
Missouri.....	3,593,335	698,562
New York.....	9,113,614	1,587,983
New Jersey.....	2,537,167	424,622
Ohio.....	4,767,121	1,037,094
Pennsylvania.....	7,665,111	1,217,502
Wisconsin.....	2,333,860	399,972
Total.....	49,794,277	9,403,558

TABLE No. 4.

States.	Population 1910.	Votes 1912.
Alabama.....	1,138,693	117,873
Arizona.....	204,354	23,722
Arkansas.....	1,574,449	124,023
Florida.....	752,619	51,891
Georgia.....	2,609,121	121,420
Louisiana.....	1,656,388	79,377
Mississippi.....	1,797,114	64,523
North Carolina.....	2,206,287	244,455
Oklahoma.....	1,657,155	253,801
South Carolina.....	1,515,400	50,350
Tennessee.....	2,184,789	247,821
Texas.....	3,896,542	301,788
Virginia.....	2,661,612	136,976
Total.....	24,253,923	1,818,037

It will be noted that the 13 States in Table No. 3 have a population of 49,794,277 and cast 9,403,558 votes. Of the population 18.88 per cent voted in 1912. The 13 States in Table No. 4, containing a population of 24,253,923, cast a total vote of 1,818,037. Less than 7.5 per cent of the population of Table No. 4 of States voted in 1912.

It will be noted here that the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] was evidently hedging against this the other day when he said that the argument that we were solicitous about the Philippine Islands and cared so little about certain people living in his State was enfantillage. I am not versed in French. If he wishes to barricade himself behind a foreign tongue, all right. But I called up the Library in order to piece out my abysmal ignorance of French and asked them what it meant, and they said "child's play."

So 3.6 per cent in Mississippi vote of the entire population, and 10 per cent vote in the Philippine Islands. You think more of the Philippine Islands and the Malays than you do of Booker Washington and his race. This is not child's play. The Senator from Mississippi said if he had been a Filipino when we took possession of the islands he would have fought to the last drop of his blood. This will be advice heeded by the next revolutionary leader there who rises to accelerate our exit from that country. This is more "enfantillage."

I do not know what the rights of negro citizens will be under some decisions of the Federal Supreme Court on the grandfather clauses and under the decisions of the Federal court in *Terre Haute, Ind.*, in the *Roberts* case. Lately decisions were rendered the full scope, the pith, and moment of which are not fully appreciated yet by gentlemen who are responsible in the affairs

of government, that the grandfather clauses and certain clauses in the statutes or constitutional provisions for the literacy test were invalid as being contrary to the fifteenth war amendment. That can be worked out in due season. I only refer to it in view of the tables I have just put into the Record.

What is government? The definition of self-government was given here yesterday. Self-government in the Philippine Islands appears to be a government of 8,000,000 people by, say, 800,000, or a government of many by a few.

I submit Tables Nos. 5 and 6, showing the total wealth of certain States and the total income tax paid by the same States.

TABLE No. 5.

States.	Total wealth.	Corporation and individual income tax.
North Carolina.....	\$1,907,573,780	\$381,379.34
South Carolina.....	1,351,400,753	161,401.95
Mississippi.....	1,344,890,020	108,180.63
Florida.....	1,049,138,228	229,509.82
Total.....	5,552,972,781	880,471.77

TABLE No. 6.

States.	Total wealth.	Corporation and individual income tax.
New York.....	\$25,011,145,223	\$27,633,741.25
Illinois.....	15,484,453,231	5,654,157.35
Pennsylvania.....	15,457,533,277	9,367,096.34
Massachusetts.....	6,302,989,392	4,533,144.91
Total.....	62,256,074,124	42,365,185.75

It will be observed that the first four States named in Table No. 5 have 2.95 per cent of the total wealth of the United States, which is estimated at \$187,739,071,090.

These tables show the wealth, vote, and population of the country, and there is nothing left in government but its institutions, as far as public affairs are involved. So, if the Government of the people is to be preserved in this matter at the present time, it is a misgovernment, a government of many by a few, taxation of many by a few, collection of three-fourths of the income from certain localities, persons, and things, and its expenditure by one-fourth of those, or a number represented by one-fourth of the payments.

The total wealth of the first four States is \$5,552,972,781, compared with \$62,256,074,124 in the last four. The corporation and individual income tax paid by the first four is \$880,471.77, and the like tax paid by the last four \$42,365,185.78. The first four States have 2.95 per cent of the wealth of the United States, and pay one ninety-first of the total corporation and individual income tax. The last four States have 33½ per cent of the total wealth of the United States, and pay 52.83 per cent of the total corporation and individual income tax.

I submit Table No. 7 of certain other States, with the several amounts of corporation and individual income tax paid by each and the total wealth of each. It illustrates how the tariff act of October 3, 1913, has distributed unequally the burden of direct taxation. It does not fall upon the wealth of the country, but upon a certain class of wealth. It ought not therefore be the principal source of revenue, neither ought it be intensified by lowering the exemption or by such taxes as the emergency act of October 22, 1914.

TABLE No. 7.

States.	Total wealth.	Corporation and individual income tax.
Rhode Island.....	\$970,802,690	\$711,111.63
Nebraska.....	3,794,986,781	361,373.32
Maryland.....	2,177,958,864	1,021,879.61
Connecticut.....	2,285,454,659	1,283,695.97
Iowa.....	7,868,454,211	733,488.69
Michigan.....	5,427,022,651	2,913,308.13
Delaware.....	307,948,613	282,791.04
North Dakota.....	2,141,626,961	97,496.68
Louisiana.....	2,164,437,746	526,177.94
Alabama.....	2,127,054,930	261,760.79

But little comment is necessary. It is proper to emphasize, however, certain features of this inequality. Rhode Island has barely more than one-fourth of the wealth of Nebraska and pays nearly twice the income tax. Maryland possesses about the same wealth of Louisiana and pays nearly double the income

tax. The wealth of Louisiana and Alabama are nearly equal, yet Louisiana pays over twice the income tax of Alabama. Delaware has one-seventh of Alabama and yet pays more income tax than the latter.

By comparing the wealth of Iowa in the last table with that of Massachusetts in the former table it is found that Iowa's wealth exceeds that of Massachusetts by \$1,500,000,000, yet Iowa pays \$733,488 income tax, while Massachusetts pays \$4,536,141, or more than six times the burden, although possessed of vastly less wealth.

North Dakota's wealth nearly equals that of Louisiana. Louisiana, however, pays nearly five and a half times as much income tax. Connecticut, with wealth comparatively little more than North Dakota, pays over 13 times as much income tax. Nebraska, with nearly four times the wealth of Rhode Island, pays but a little over one-half as much income tax.

I submit certain other tables, No. 8 and No. 9, showing manufacturing data:

TABLE NO. 8.—Summary.

States.	Capital.	Salaries.	Wages.	Value of products.
Alabama.....	\$173,180,000	\$6,565,000	\$27,284,000	\$145,962,000
Arizona.....	32,873,000	798,000	5,505,000	50,257,000
Arkansas.....	70,174,000	3,461,000	19,113,000	74,916,000
Florida.....	69,291,000	4,955,000	22,982,000	72,890,000
Georgia.....	202,778,000	9,062,000	34,805,000	202,863,000
Iowa.....	221,816,000	9,008,000	33,386,000	223,949,000
Louisiana.....	72,393,000	3,654,000	18,768,000	80,555,000
Mississippi.....	217,185,000	6,903,000	34,355,000	216,656,000
North Carolina.....	38,873,000	2,045,000	7,240,000	53,682,000
Oklahoma.....	173,221,000	3,756,000	20,361,000	113,235,000
South Carolina.....	167,923,000	9,186,000	28,251,000	180,216,000
Tennessee.....	216,876,000	10,868,000	37,907,000	272,896,000
Texas.....	216,392,000	9,101,000	38,154,000	219,794,000
Virginia.....				
Total.....	1,868,975,000	79,362,000	328,111,000	1,907,872,000

TABLE NO. 9.—Summary.

States.	Capital.	Salaries.	Wages.	Value of products.
California.....	\$537,134,000	\$22,955,000	\$84,142,000	\$529,761,000
Connecticut.....	517,546,000	25,637,000	110,119,000	490,272,000
Illinois.....	1,548,171,000	91,449,000	273,319,000	1,919,277,000
Indiana.....	508,717,000	26,304,000	95,510,000	579,975,000
Massachusetts.....	1,279,687,000	63,279,000	301,174,000	1,490,529,000
Michigan.....	583,947,000	34,870,000	118,968,000	685,101,000
Minnesota.....	275,416,000	15,451,000	47,470,000	403,419,000
Missouri.....	444,343,000	28,994,000	80,843,000	574,111,000
New York.....	2,779,497,000	186,032,000	557,231,000	3,353,490,000
New Jersey.....	997,172,000	48,337,000	169,710,000	1,145,529,000
Ohio.....	1,300,733,000	72,147,000	245,450,000	1,437,936,000
Pennsylvania.....	2,749,006,000	110,897,000	455,627,000	2,626,742,000
Wisconsin.....	605,657,000	25,737,000	93,905,000	599,365,000
Total.....	14,127,026,000	752,083,000	2,633,468,000	15,847,553,000

The foregoing tables indicate in what part of the United States the volume of manufacturing is. The capital stock employed, as shown in Table No. 9, is nearly eight times as great as in the part of the country embraced in Table No. 8. The wages are more than eight times in Table No. 9 those in Table No. 8. The value of products in Table No. 9 exceed those in Table No. 8 more than eight times. In the great group of States in Table No. 9 is transacted the business on which falls the present burden of the emergency tax of October 22, 1914.

The transactions in assembling the raw material, the creation and distribution of the finished product, the commercial transactions between the buyer and the seller, the immense transportation required to reach the consumer and in the export trade of our surplus are all burdened with the direct taxes in the emergency act of 1914.

The proposal in the President's message for further taxes would place upon this great volume of business at least three-fourths of such tax, leaving the other portions of the Union to escape their just share.

CONCLUSIONS.

In conclusion, I summarize from the foregoing conditions:

Revision of the tariff along lines of protection so as to produce additional customs duties.

A discontinuance of excise taxes, such as the emergency act of October 22, 1914, continued for one year by this Congress.

An inheritance tax divided proportionately, say 50 per cent each to the Government and the several States.

A readjustment of corporation and individual income tax.

Economy in appropriations and expenditures.

A defeat of such measures as the Government shipping bill and a reduction of appropriations of the rivers and harbors bill

to indispensable improvements such as connect themselves with a general plan of inland and ocean navigation.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself for a very few minutes only to the bill under consideration.

Most of the argument on this question has been directed to the ability or inability of the Filipino people to maintain a stable self-government. From my standpoint this is not the vital question. It is probable that they can not assure to themselves a government entirely free from turmoil or uprising. There is at least danger of such conditions. It is quite certain to my mind that they can not claim such qualification for self-government as is possessed by the American people. But that may also be said as to some of the great European powers. Their monarchical forms of government and their willingness to submit to it indicate characteristics that would hardly, from our view, fit them for our republican system. But I should not for that reason regard it as the duty of this Government to reform their system. I can not but believe that the creation of any class of privileged persons, the creation and maintenance of degrees of nobility, which engenders a spirit of egotism and arrogance in one individual and a spirit of subservience in another, is destructive of the highest standard of individual character, and this whether the aristocracy be a military or civil one. Its baneful effects upon the character of a people are the same. But does that fact impose upon us the duty to seize or hold aristocracy-ridden England or military-ridden Germany for the purpose of reform, for the purpose of fitting them for a republican form of government, or any of these great powers of Europe who see fit to live under a different form of government?

I shall vote to strike out the preamble, not because it declares a purpose to ultimately give independence to the Filipino people, but because by its words it leaves the discretion entirely with the United States, without reference to the judgment or desire of the Filipino people themselves.

The Philippine Archipelago came to us as the result of conquest, without the consent of its inhabitants and against their protest, backed by all their power of resistance. As these islands were acquired by force, they are now held by force. We justify their retention on the grounds that it is for the best interest of their people. We justify it on wholly altruistic motives; and that leads us directly to the question of both the right and duty of this Government to hold a foreign people and their territory, whose possession is in no way essential to the life or defense of our own Government. Were these islands so close to our own shores that their possession by any other power would endanger our national safety, we might justify their retention on the grounds of self-defense. But no such exigency now exists or can exist, and we are face to face with the moral question, Ought we to hold a foreign race in a foreign land for the sole purpose of fitting them for a higher degree of self-government or a higher citizenship?

If we have a right to hold a people against their will for that purpose, then we must also have the right to take possession of other like people for the same purpose; for the right to hold must be buttressed on the right to seize. If that is our moral privilege, as well as our moral duty, toward those who have not achieved our standard of enlightenment, then is it not just as much our duty and our right to seize the Chinese Empire and by force teach these people our higher civilization and fit them for self-government? They seem to have entirely failed in maintaining such a government. The fire of revolution has but recently destroyed their old monarchical government, but before the ashes have cooled another dynasty has been erected on its ruins. Here is a mighty field for the exercise of our desire to civilize a people up to our standard. We do not avail ourselves of this opportunity for educational work because we recognize that national rights are superior to our desire to reform.

Mr. President, in my opinion, while we may be excused for taking possession of the Philippine Islands under the circumstances, and while we may have been justified in paying \$20,000,000 to secure the release of these people from oppression of another Government, we have no right to hold that foreign people by force and against their will and compel them to remain under our control for such length of time as we, not they, may consider it for their best interest. I contend these people have national rights which we are morally bound to respect.

Looking at it from the standpoint of our own interest, I confess the only object our possession has so far subserved has been an excuse for the construction and maintenance of an enormous Navy. We all know that these islands constitute our only vulnerable point of attack, and they therefore offer a needed and cherished excuse to those whose patriotism always runs toward war and military prowess to demand an ever-increasing Army and Navy fully adequate for their protection against assault.

So long as we hold these islands we, of course, must be able to protect them in case we are at war.

It is well known to-day that we could not defend them against the nearest great Asiatic power. To do so we must double the size of our Navy. We must add immensely to our Army. We must burden our people with a mighty armament to defend a little group of islands which are of no value whatever to us and which wish to free themselves from us—islands whose possession invites attack by any Government with which we might possibly have a quarrel. Not only this, but the fact that they can so easily be attacked and their defense by us would be attended with such difficulties encourages and invites hostilities against us. A nation might well be content, if at war with us, to simply take immediate possession of those islands and allow us to waste our strength in attempting to regain them, where such nation would never dream of crossing the ocean to strike a blow at us within our own waters.

Mr. President, I favor most heartily the extension of the right of self-government provided in the resolution. The capabilities of this people for full and complete independence may possibly be foreshadowed in their use or abuse of the additional governmental powers here conferred. But only a violent and gross abuse of the power would justify our interference.

I do not wish to be understood, without further consideration of the matter, as favoring the release of these people from our tutelage without any further act of ours. While I do not admit there is a moral duty of this Government to force our civilization upon them, the fact that they have been under our care and adoption creates ties of deeper friendship and more earnest wishes for their welfare than would otherwise obtain. Though forced into submission, they are still to some extent our foster child, and we may well deal with them with greater concern for their welfare.

What they want above all things is independence, not only from us but from all other powers, and we ought to secure an understanding from every great power of the world that their independence shall be respected. The Senator from Colorado used the word "protectorate." That is not what we want and not what they want. Protectorate carries with it a sort of right of interference—a sort of subindependence only. The agreement that we should secure should be of a negative character, not that the powers should protect the independence of the islands from each other but that they should each and all refrain from interfering with their independence.

There is no use, Mr. President, in our dodging or veering from the real object which we had in view when we forced Spain to cede those islands to us. Our motives were not at that time wholly altruistic, but rather wholly commercial. We were not looking for opportunities to extend our civilization, but to extend our trade. We had awakened at that time to the trade possibilities of the Orient. Hawaii and the Philippines were to be the stepping stones across the ocean and ultimately lead us to the goal of our hopes—trade with China and the Orient generally. The reformation of the Philippine people, for their own salvation, was a secondary sentiment. Since that time, another great aggressive tradelike, as well as warlike, nation has arisen out of the sea and now obscures to considerable extent our roseate commercial view.

We have learned in the last 16 years that the people who can most cheaply produce and deliver their goods to the Orient will monopolize the selling trade of that section of the world; and that schooled in the most rigid frugality and with a wage scale almost infinitesimal as compared with labor wages here, the Nippon will undoubtedly command the selling trade to the Orient. We do not need any Philippine Islands to insure us a buying trade. We can buy all we want if we have the price to pay.

As a commercial asset these islands have proved worse than useless. Every dollar of benefit has cost us a hundred dollars of loss.

But the worst aspect of the Philippine proposition, so far as it affects us, is that it forces us into the un-American policy of entering into an armament competition which has taxed the very life out of the Old World. So long as we hold the Philippine Islands we must be prepared to defend them against invasion in case of war, and that means that we must have a more powerful Navy than any European or Asiatic power with which we would be liable to have war. I say "liable to have war" because I do not think there would be any possibility of war between this country and Great Britain. There are conditions which would keep her from ever engaging in war with us.

The responsibility of holding these islands is enormous, both in its expensiveness and in its effect upon our national charac-

ter. With a fair navy and proper submarine and coast defenses we need have no fear of any nation declaring an aggressive war against us on this side of the ocean. But with our territorial body projected some 6,000 miles from our real shore—projected into another hemisphere, surrounded by a yellow race whose friendship we have not by our historical conduct sought very earnestly to cultivate, a race which believes it has been slighted by us, and which has taken offense at our exclusion policies, we shall need to maintain a far greater Navy. And just to the extent that we create a war organ, Navy or Army, whose only function is war, just to that extent do we create a desire that these organs perform their functions, and just to that extent we create the military spirit in this country.

But, as I have suggested, I believe we can secure from the great governments of the world an agreement to respect the independence of the islands. When such agreement has been secured, when we can give to these people an independence which we can assure, and which other nations would respect, then we should show to them and to the world that this country, rising above every semblance of greed and pride of possession, is capable of doing an act of justice and philanthropy to another people never before voluntarily performed by any other country in the whole history of war and conquest.

I do not entirely agree with the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], because it provides for independence first and the securing of an agreement to respect that independence afterwards. I should prefer, Mr. President, and I think the Filipinos themselves would prefer, that we first secure an assurance from the great powers of the world that their independence would not be interfered with; that we then prepare to call a convention in those islands to adopt a constitution and a republican form of government; that we then proceed to organize that government; and when it is fully organized, when the officers have been elected and this agreement has been secured, we then declare them independent of the United States.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota pardon an inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. CLAPP. Does not the Senator also feel that the nations that we might consult would very much more appreciate our consulting them before than after the granting of independence? It strikes me that it would appeal to them much more strongly than to consult them after we had already decided it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think, Mr. President, they would not only more appreciate being consulted before independence was declared, but I think they would be far more likely to accede to a request that they keep their hands off the Filipinos while the islands are still in our hands than after we had released them from our control.

Mr. CLAPP. It strikes me so.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have epitomized the sentiments which I have expressed into an amendment, which I offered yesterday and asked to have printed. I will ask the Secretary to read the amendment at this time as the closing part of my address upon this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the amendment, as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following:

"The President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to indicate to the great powers of the world the desire of this Government to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Philippine people full and complete independence whenever it shall be warranted in the belief that such independence will be permanent and be respected by the other powers of the world. The President is further authorized and requested to secure from such other powers such agreements as will insure the independence of said islands in perpetuity, and when such agreements have been made he shall forthwith direct a convention to be held in such islands for the purpose of adopting a constitution providing for a republican form of government; and as soon as such constitution has been adopted and officers have been elected and a government inaugurated thereunder, he shall, by proclamation, declare such islands and the people thereof to be a free and independent state, with all the powers of complete sovereignty."

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, it is not my intention to make any extended remarks at this time, but as we approach a vote on this question I can not refrain from saying a few words in favor of the bill and in behalf of the Filipino people.

I have been interested in the Philippine Islands ever since May 4, 1898, when Admiral Dewey won the Battle of Manila Bay, one of the most brilliant naval victories in all history. I had a friend, Mr. William Weaver, of Seneca, Kans., who participated in that battle as a gunner on the *Olympia*, the admiral's flagship, which gave me a personal interest in that

great event. Kansas is especially interested in the government of the islands and the welfare of the Filipino people by reason of the fact that the present vice governor, Hon. Henderson S. Martin, was appointed by the President to that position from Marion, Kans., and he has had much to do with the writing of the present bill. By virtue of his office he is also at the head of the bureau of education in the islands and has done much to assist the young people of the islands to receive an education sufficient for self-government. Over 500,000 Filipino children are now attending school and studying the English language and American institutions in these islands. More than 9,000 Filipino teachers are now teaching the common branches in English in these schools. Gov. Martin was so greatly interested in this bill, so thoroughly convinced of its great benefit to the Filipino people and to this country, that he came all the way from the Philippines to give evidence before the Senate committee at the last session of Congress, and was exceedingly anxious that the bill should pass that session. Gov. Martin gave valuable evidence before the committee, taking the position, after thoroughly studying the question on the ground, that the Filipino people are ready now for self-government and that the United States should grant them independence at the earliest possible moment.

I am heartily in favor of this bill, because it gives to the Filipino people a greater measure of self-government than they have before enjoyed, and is a decided step forward toward the ultimate fulfillment of the promises of the United States Government to grant to them absolute independence. So far as I am concerned, I am willing they should have their independence just as quickly as it is possible to be arranged. From all the testimony before the committee at the hearings, it is clearly demonstrated that they are capable of governing themselves; not in a way, perhaps, that we would like to govern them, but in a way that they want to govern themselves. I do not suppose that any American would admit that the Filipino people, or any other people in the world for that matter, are as capable as ourselves to govern. Most American citizens believe that the United States is the best-governed country in the world; but this does not necessarily mean that we are more capable of governing another country and a different race of people than the people of that country themselves.

These people have already shown remarkable advancement in education, civilization, and ability to govern. Nearly all of the offices in the Philippines are now successfully filled by Filipinos—a majority of the commission who constitute the upper house of the legislature, all the members of the lower house, all the governors of the various Provinces, and nearly all of the officers and employees of the municipal governments are Filipinos and are faithfully discharging their respective duties with honesty and fidelity. Every member of the lower house, composed of 81 members, is a college graduate, a distinction not possessed by any other legislative body in the world. A very valuable comparative statement furnished by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFER] in his eloquent and very exhaustive address on this subject recently delivered in the Senate, shows the percentage of illiteracy to be less in the Philippines than in most of the South American Republics and in many of the nations of Europe.

The Philippine Islands are 7,000 miles away, and are inhabited by about 8,000,000 people who wish to govern themselves, and who ask us, the great American people, to free them from the yoke which binds them to us, and which was placed on their necks through no fault of theirs, and without their consent. The Declaration of Independence provides—

That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

No man or set of men has a right to take from us any of these inalienable rights prescribed in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. Demanding these rights for ourselves, we ought to be willing to treat others in exactly the same way and recognize their rights to those things which we declare to be sacred to us. The Filipino people did not consent that we govern them; and now, wanting independence for themselves, this great principle of liberty which is so dear to the people of this country ought to be extended to them without further controversy, even if there were no other reasons demanding that it be done. I believe that it is not only to the best interests of the Filipino people, but also to the best interests of the people of the United States, that the Philippines should be free and independent. It is estimated that the islands have cost us about \$600,000,000, and there has been no monetary return to this country. It has been well worth the price, however, if through

our aid and influence we have helped a poor struggling nation of people to a position of self-government. As stated by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] in his splendid speech on this bill the other day:

The American occupation of the Philippine Islands is the finest example of an altruistic effort by a great country to bring the blessings of civilized government to a weak people. In all the history of the world there is nothing that approaches it.

More than this, it was never the intention of our Government to keep the Philippines as absolutely our own and to have the same become a part of our country any more than it was our intention to keep Cuba and permit it to become a part of our country. There would have been more sound sense and reason for retaining Cuba than the Philippines, but it was contrary to the policy of our Government to do so. In the circumstances, as the result of the war with Spain, it became our duty to establish a stable government in both countries, which we have done. We turned the government of Cuba over to her own people long ago, and it is now time to turn the government of the Philippines over to her own people, aside from the necessary time required to put the new governmental machinery into complete operation. The Filipino people, or at least those in authority to represent them and who are qualified to speak, are satisfied with this bill, and it ought therefore to be satisfactory to us.

We only have to consider the feelings of our own people in the Revolutionary period to understand the feelings of these people now. The American people were demanding the same right to be free from England. All the arguments which have been made here against this bill were made in the English Parliament against us. Only a few brave men like Edmund Burke and William Pitt, in the House of Commons, and Lord Camden, in the House of Lords, championed the cause of the colonists. Are we Americans, who believe we were right then, to so far forget ourselves now as to say that the principle of liberty contended for is wrong when applied to another people?

Liberty to man has been of very slow growth since first the flight of time began. It has been hindered and obstructed upon every turn. Those who have attained it have been obliged to fight for it from the earliest time down to the present day. Hence it was that John Philpot Curran remarked that, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Thomas Jefferson once said that, "The God who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time." Liberty is as precious as life itself. It was the realization of this truth that prompted Patrick Henry to use that fiery but most patriotic expression in his immortal speech, "Give me liberty or give me death!"

Some of the opposition contend that the Filipino people are not prepared for independence because of the way they live, claiming they have not sufficiently pretentious habitations and are not properly cultivated in the modern way of living. While most of the people have modest homes, yet they are generally suitable to their race and climate, and many of the citizens in the cities live in magnificent modern residences. But the poet Pope has forcefully answered that argument in the following suggestive lines:

Give me again my hollow tree,
A crust of bread, and liberty!

There ought not to be a single voice of the American people, who know of the awful struggle we passed through to secure this same sacred right, raised against this bill. I certainly hope it will pass. It will be the means of adding another republic to the galaxy of nations, and will be a lesson to the Old World which they may well emulate, since their greatest troubles through the terrible war in which they are now engaged came from monarchies and distant possessions. Pass this bill and joy will go up over this country and through the Philippine Islands equal to that when the stamp act was repealed by the English Parliament, and Edmund Burke exclaimed, "It caused more universal joy throughout the English dominions than perhaps any other act that can be remembered."

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHILTON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 14, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13, 1916.
CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSIONER.

Capt. Richard Park, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Débris Commis-

sion provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Maj. Robert R. Raymond, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be probational second lieutenants, with rank from January 12, 1916.

Gilbert Dudley Fish, of New York.
George Mayo, of the District of Columbia.
Paul Theodore Bock, of New York.
Charles Otis Boynton, of California.
Arthur Peter von Deesten, of New York.
Edward Nelson Whitney, of Wisconsin.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

William W. Perry to be postmaster at West Blocton, Ala., in place of W. D. McCrary, deceased.
Robert M. Rawls to be postmaster at Athens, Ala., in place of W. W. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expires January 15, 1916.

CALIFORNIA.

John E. Nolan to be postmaster at Jamestown, Cal., in place of Howard A. Preston. Incumbent's commission expires January 15, 1916.

COLORADO.

Elsie E. Da Lee Elliott to be postmaster at Redcliff, Colo. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.
Jerry F. Halloran to be postmaster at Victor, Colo., in place of Frank Simonton. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1916.
Stephen Ilgenfritz to be postmaster at Ordway, Colo., in place of Alexander Gray, resigned.
Joseph Ray, to be postmaster at Aguilar, Colo., in place of Fannie Pearl. Incumbent's commission expires January 24, 1916.
Fanny Hamilton Simpson to be postmaster at La Veta, Colo., in place of R. V. Cuttler. Incumbent's commission expires January 16, 1916.

CONNECTICUT.

Robert D. Burns to be postmaster at Saybrook, Conn., in place of John A. Ayer. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

DELAWARE.

John T. Ratledge to be postmaster at Elsmere, Del. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

FLORIDA.

Richard J. Mays to be postmaster at Monticello, Fla., in place of Richard J. Mays. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1915.
James A. Haisten to be postmaster at Cocoa, Fla., in place of C. J. Schoonmaker. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1916.

IDAHO.

Jessie Beasley to be postmaster at Wardner, Idaho, in place of Jesse Beasley, to correct name of appointee.
Josephine Ervin to be postmaster at Mullen, Idaho, in place of Josephine Erwin, to correct name of appointee.

ILLINOIS.

J. H. Bumsted to be postmaster at Carpentersville, Ill., in place of Minnie E. Henry. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1915.
Charles E. Carlson to be postmaster at Woodhull, Ill., in place of George E. Swanson. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1915.
H. B. Conover to be postmaster at Orion, Ill., in place of George P. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1915.
W. T. Clopper to be postmaster at Polo, Ill., in place of Harry E. Spear. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1915.
Jacob F. Davis to be postmaster at Minier, Ill., in place of Charles E. Tanner, resigned.
William F. De Frenne to be postmaster at Prairie du Rocher, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

J. H. Farquharson to be postmaster at Western Springs, Ill., in place of William A. Collins. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

Max Geisenhoner to be postmaster at East Dubuque, Ill., in place of M. J. Platt. Incumbent's commission expired July 14, 1915.

A. W. Hilbolt to be postmaster at Dongola, Ill., in place of G. W. Coughanowr. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1915.

Pearl A. Hollingsworth to be postmaster at Fisher, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

J. F. Knight to be postmaster at Sandoval, Ill., in place of Hiram Wilson. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1916.

Grover C. Lindley to be postmaster at Hutsonville, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Elmer Lummis to be postmaster at Quincy, Ill., in place of David F. Wilcox, removed.

Robert A. McFarland to be postmaster at Livingston, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Thomas J. McMahon to be postmaster at Chebanse, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

C. D. Miller to be postmaster at Milledgeville, Ill., in place of S. M. Kaisinger. Incumbent's commission expired August 21, 1915.

Edward J. Mulligan to be postmaster at Bradley, Ill., in place of Joseph Suprenant. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1915.

Joseph H. Mulligan to be postmaster at Kewanee, Ill., in place of Albert W. Errett. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1915.

Frank L. O'Brien to be postmaster at Maple Park, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

E. S. Perkins to be postmaster at Newark, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Robert W. Perkins to be postmaster at Erie, Ill., in place of Edmund J. Howell. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

B. J. Ritson to be postmaster at Farmington, Ill., in place of Sewell P. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1914.

Emma R. Ritzman to be postmaster at Orangeville, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Albert Schrieber to be postmaster at Red Bud, Ill., in place of August Kalbitz. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1915.

Richard J. Simmons to be postmaster at Macomb, Ill., in place of William H. Hainline, removed.

W. W. Sloan to be postmaster at Rockton, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Edward Streng to be postmaster at Stewardson, Ill., in place of Caleb T. Reeder. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1915.

W. J. Sullivan to be postmaster at Hanover, Ill., in place of Thomas D. Shipton. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1915.

Henry Uphaus to be postmaster at Macon, Ill., in place of Anthus Willard. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1915.

Louis Wolter to be postmaster at Marissa, Ill., in place of John W. Church. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1915.

INDIANA.

Maurice L. Cory to be postmaster at Kingman, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Louis H. Kocher to be postmaster at Churubusco, Ind., in place of Willard Z. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires January 16, 1916.

William W. Ludtke to be postmaster at Rolling Prairie, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

IOWA.

W. D. Jamieson to be postmaster at Shenandoah, Iowa, in place of H. E. Deater. Incumbent's commission expired June 7, 1915.

Martin P. Klindt to be postmaster at St. Ansgar, Iowa, in place of Isaac Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

J. B. Lower to be postmaster at Scranton, Iowa, in place of E. W. McCracken. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1915.

George P. Martin to be postmaster at Peterson, Iowa, in place of Grace Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1915.

William H. Moore to be postmaster at Shelby, Iowa, in place of W. H. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

KANSAS.

B. M. Palmer to be postmaster at Jewell, Kans., in place of C. F. Schafer. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1916.

J. H. Rathbun to be postmaster at Downs, Kans., in place of John Wolfert, resigned.

Charles C. Seewir to be postmaster at Lawrence, Kans., in place of Charles S. Finch. Incumbent's commission expired July 31, 1915.

Leonard Willems to be postmaster at Lansing, Kans., in place of W. A. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

KENTUCKY.

Tarleton C. Hobbs to be postmaster at Anchorage, Ky., in place of H. O. Hausgen. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1916.

Hubert Hutton to be postmaster at Berry, Ky. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Judith W. Montgomery to be postmaster at Greensburg, Ky. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

MAINE.

Oscar H. Dilworth to be postmaster at Madison, Me., in place of G. A. Herrick. Incumbent's commission expires February 21, 1916.

James L. Foster to be postmaster at Livermore Falls, Me., in place of J. F. Jefferds, resigned.

Theodore C. Haley to be postmaster at Rangeley, Me., in place of G. A. Proctor. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

Frederick W. Hartnett to be postmaster at Bath, Me., in place of Edward W. Hyde. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1915.

Franklin K. Jack to be postmaster at Bowdoinham, Me., in place of W. W. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1915.

Edward Lynch to be postmaster at South Berwick, Me., in place of W. H. Downs. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1916.

MARYLAND.

J. B. Sweeney to be postmaster at Hagerstown, Md., in place of H. K. Startzman. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1916.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William M. Allen to be postmaster at Fairhaven, Mass., in place of E. G. Spooner. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1916.

John A. Bell to be postmaster at Leicester, Mass., in place of George O. Currier. Incumbent's commission expired August 18, 1915.

Perry F. Brown to be postmaster at Northampton, Mass., in place of L. L. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1915.

Edmund Daly to be postmaster at Hingham, Mass., in place of George S. Marsh. Incumbent's commission expired August 21, 1915.

William W. McLehose to be postmaster at Norton, Mass., in place of J. C. Pratt. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1915.

Joseph F. Murrman to be postmaster at Clinton, Mass., in place of E. L. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1915.

Stephen C. Luce to be postmaster at Vineyard Haven, Mass., in place of Stephen C. Luce. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1915.

Levi Wing to be postmaster at Marion, Mass., in place of F. M. Tripp. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

MICHIGAN.

John W. Barley to be postmaster at Dexter, Mich., in place of C. H. Stannard. Incumbent's commission expires January 18, 1916.

John Blair to be postmaster at Plainwell, Mich., in place of E. J. Chart. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1916.

James H. Bush to be postmaster at Norway, Mich., in place of W. R. Bolitho. Incumbent's commission expires January 16, 1916.

Elmer Bremer to be postmaster at Montgomery, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Charles E. Dean to be postmaster at Mesick, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

George M. Hubbard to be postmaster at Hudsonville, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Henry McCarty to be postmaster at Fremont, Mich., in place of A. T. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1915.

James McKenna to be postmaster at Sault St. Marie, Mich., in place of C. H. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires January 16, 1916.

Edward J. Marrinane to be postmaster at Grass Lake, Mich., in place of George Preston. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1915.

Robert O. Mimmack to be postmaster at Plymouth, Mich., in place of Mark H. Ladd. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1916.

Charles Powers to be postmaster at Saugatuck, Mich., in place of Fred Wade. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1915.

William G. White to be postmaster at Ovid, Mich., in place of J. L. Gumaer. Incumbent's commission expires February 21, 1916.

MINNESOTA.

Jessie J. W. Hogue to be postmaster at Tyler, Minn., in place of T. T. Gronlund. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1915.

P. J. Johnson to be postmaster at Boyd, Minn., in place of O. J. Flaa. Incumbent's commission expires February 7, 1916.

Francis T. O'Gorman to be postmaster at Goodhue, Minn., in place of D. C. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1915.

Otto N. Rath to be postmaster at St. Paul, Minn., in place of Edward Yannish. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1915.

James J. Remes to be postmaster at New Prague, Minn., in place of J. Maertz. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1915.

Joseph A. Schoenhoff to be postmaster at Sauk Center, Minn., in place of Oliver B. Boobar. Incumbent's commission expires January 15, 1916.

MISSISSIPPI.

Sheppard Lamar Martin to be postmaster at Wiggins, Miss., in place of U. B. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires January 15, 1916.

Emma L. Whyte to be postmaster at Bond, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

MISSOURI.

James J. Davis, jr., to be postmaster at St. Marys, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

MONTANA.

Lawrence C. Porter to be postmaster at Winifred, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

George E. Shawler to be postmaster at Geraldine, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Meta W. Shaw to be postmaster at Terry, Mont., in place of E. H. McDowell, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

O. C. Lamb to be postmaster at Guide Rock, Nebr., in place of E. M. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires January 18, 1916.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Edward S. Perkins to be postmaster at Sunapee, N. H., in place of N. P. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

Samuel Runlett to be postmaster at Durham, N. H., in place of G. D. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1916.

Joseph Warren to be postmaster at Rochester, N. H., in place of J. S. Kimball. Incumbent's commission expires January 18, 1916.

NEW JERSEY.

Joseph Edward Charles to be postmaster at Wenonah, N. J., in place of J. W. English. Incumbent's commission expires January 18, 1916.

Charles G. Hatcher to be postmaster at Smithville, N. J., in place of W. H. Willitts. Incumbent's commission expires January 24, 1916.

NEW MEXICO.

Arthur F. Jones to be postmaster at Portales, N. Mex., in place of C. O. Leach. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1916.

Edgar Savage to be postmaster at Elida, N. Mex., in place of Henry Rankin. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

NEW YORK.

August P. Bolender to be postmaster at Collins, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Patrick H. Cantillon to be postmaster at Perrysburg, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Claude S. Cooper to be postmaster at Odessa, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Roy E. Dietrich to be postmaster at La Fargeville, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Hans C. Hansen to be postmaster at Fishers Island in place of Hans C. Hansen. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1916.

George F. Ketchum to be postmaster at Warwick, N. Y., in place of Hiram Tate. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1915.

John P. Purcell to be postmaster at New Dorp, N. Y., in place of W. L. Conner. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1915.

NEVADA.

E. T. George to be postmaster at Battle Mountain, Nev., in place of H. S. Starrett. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1916.

Laura Hoegh to be postmaster at Eureka, Nev., in place of C. L. Broy. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1915.

George W. Likes to be postmaster at Fallon, Nev., in place of Albert J. Johnson, resigned.

James J. McQuillan to be postmaster at Tonopah, Nev., in place of J. W. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1915.

Thomas D. Rogers to be postmaster at Manhattan, Nev., in place of W. B. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1915.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Abraham F. Anderson to be postmaster at Turtle Lake, N. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

George L. Barrett to be postmaster at Lakota, N. Dak., in place of J. McC. McMaster. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1915.

John E. Dick to be postmaster at McVillie, N. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Gilbert M. Eng to be postmaster at Douglas, N. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Harriet M. Frank to be postmaster at Powers Lake, N. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

H. M. Haakenson to be postmaster at Hatton, N. Dak., in place of H. M. Haakenson. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1916.

William F. L. Makee to be postmaster at Noonan, N. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

C. D. Rittenhouse to be postmaster at Wahpeton, N. Dak., in place of E. H. Myhra. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

O. L. Toftner to be postmaster at Kenmare, N. Dak., in place of G. E. Child. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1915.

OHIO.

Morris Albaugh to be postmaster at Murray, Ohio, in place of Harry H. Frazee, resigned.

Joel C. Clore to be postmaster at Cincinnati, Ohio, in place of John L. Shuff, resigned.

Patrick J. Dunn to be postmaster at Strasburg, Ohio, in place of Philip Zeigler. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1916.

Albert E. Kroske to be postmaster at Arlington, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

C. D. Royer to be postmaster at Bowerston, Ohio, in place of O. O. Price. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1915.

OKLAHOMA.

J. L. Buckley to be postmaster at Texoma, Okla., in place of G. H. Langston. Incumbent's commission expires January 24, 1916.

Thomas B. Dunlap to be postmaster at Ringling, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Charley M. Foll to be postmaster at Jennings, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

J. A. Miller to be postmaster at Beaver, Okla., in place of J. R. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expires January 24, 1916.

John R. Reynolds to be postmaster at Hastings, Okla., in place of J. P. Brawley, resigned.

OREGON.

T. J. Anderson to be postmaster at Harrisburg, Oreg., in place of C. L. Morris. Incumbent's commission expires January 15, 1916.

James W. Dunn to be postmaster at St. Benedict, Oreg. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William H. Cooper to be postmaster at Oakmont, Pa., in place of G. S. Stoup. Incumbent's commission expires January 24, 1916.

William F. Elgin to be postmaster at Glen Olden, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Percy E. Faust to be postmaster at Weatherly, Pa., in place of J. M. Dreher. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

P. H. Gherrity to be postmaster at Bellefonte, Pa., in place of H. C. Valentine. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1916.

Howard Kemrer to be postmaster at Paradise, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Frank W. McFadden to be postmaster at McKeesport, Pa., in place of John N. Dersam, resigned.

William K. Reed to be postmaster at Eddystone, Pa., in place of Robert Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1915.

RHODE ISLAND.

Sumner Mowry to be postmaster at Peace Dale, R. I., in place of John A. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1916.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Richard T. King, jr., to be postmaster at Georgetown, S. C., in place of S. M. Ward, resigned.

Albert C. Ligon to be postmaster at Orangeburg, S. C., in place of A. D. Webster. Incumbent's commission expires February 21, 1916.

M. J. Spears to be postmaster at Lamar, S. C., in place of M. J. Spears. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1915.

TEXAS.

W. F. Lancaster to be postmaster at Bowie, Tex., in place of J. S. Wells. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1915.

Osceola G. Wilson to be postmaster at Nixon, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

UTAH.

William A. Jones to be postmaster at Spanish Fork, Utah., in place of L. O. Lawrence. Incumbent's commission expires January 15, 1916.

VIRGINIA.

William A. Coates to be postmaster at South Washington, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

John L. Henley to be postmaster at Tappahannock, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

WASHINGTON.

Eugene J. Edson to be postmaster at Coulee City, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1915.

J. T. Harris to be postmaster at Ridgefield, Wash., in place of J. W. Blackburn. Incumbent's commission expires February 13, 1916.

U. Kirby Lail to be postmaster at Sunnyside, Wash., in place of George Vetter. Incumbent's commission expires February 21, 1916.

Thomas McIntyre to be postmaster at Burlington, Wash., in place of W. O. Gregory. Incumbent's commission expires February 21, 1916.

Cleora Steele to be postmaster at Hartline, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1915.

WEST VIRGINIA.

John L. Evans to be postmaster at Summersville, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

Thomas W. Gocke to be postmaster at Piedmont, W. Va., in place of G. T. Goshorn. Incumbent's commission expires February 21, 1916.

Walter E. Reeves to be postmaster at Bethany, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

WYOMING.

William H. Cazier to be postmaster at Afton, Wyo. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 13, 1916.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

William H. Clare to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 39.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Rupert Blue to be Surgeon General.

JUDGE MUNICIPAL COURT.

George C. Aukam to be a judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Julius C. Townsend to be a lieutenant commander.
Midshipman Robert M. Fortson to be an ensign.
First Lieut. Samuel W. Bogan to be a captain in the Marine Corps.

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters:

Francis J. Wilson.
Herbert Duthie.
Herbert Van C. Wetmore.
James G. McPherson.
Stephen L. Lovett.
Albert G. Merrill.
William R. Thomas.

POSTMASTERS.

LOUISIANA.

Stacy Elizabeth Ober, Ferriday.
J. E. Ray, Boyce.

PENNSYLVANIA.

George H. Powelson, Midway.

VERMONT.

John H. Donnelly, Vergennes.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Mrs. Maurice R. Walker, Bramwell.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 13, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we turn to Thee in fervent prayer for guidance in this hour of distress. Move Thou, we beseech Thee, upon the hearts of the strong, pure, noble, brave men of our Republic that they may devise ways and means by which the rights of every American citizen may be protected on land and on sea against the greed, rapine, and murder of lawless men, whether under the pretext of war or imaginary wrongs.

We pray for a patriotism which shall lift us above parties, creeds, and selfish desires, that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness may be maintained and upheld under the Stars and Stripes for the sake of humanity, justice, and purity. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BRIDGE ACROSS BACK RIVER, GA.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. EDWARDS. For the purpose, Mr. Speaker, of submitting a unanimous-consent request. There is a bill introduced by myself, H. R. 7611, which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for the purpose of permitting the Seaboard Air Line Railway to build a bridge across the Back River at Savannah, Ga. I ask for its present consideration and passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7611) authorizing the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., a corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across what is known as "Back River," a part of the Savannah River, at a point between Jasper County, S. C., and Chatham County, Ga.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., a consolidated corporation organized under the laws of the State of Virginia and other States of the United States of America, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across what is known as Back River, a part of the Savannah River, near the city of Savannah, Ga., at or near the plantation of J. Heyward Lynah, in Jasper County, S. C., to the shore opposite thereto in Chatham County, Ga., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, and in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and all amendments thereof.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Also, the following committee amendments were read:

Amend, on page 1, line 5, by striking out, after the word "Virginia," the following:

"And other States of the United States of America."

Amend, on page 1, line 7, after the word "bridge," by striking out the words "or bridges."

Amend, on page 2, in line 5, by striking out, after the word "six," "and all amendments thereof."

Amend, on page 1, in line 3, by striking out, after the word "a," the word "consolidated."

Amend, on line 6, by striking out the words "they are" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "is."

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have not objected to unanimous consent for the consideration of these bridge bills, which have been accumulating for months, so far as the necessity for them was concerned, and I shall not object to the consideration of this bill at this time. But hereafter, unless matters come up for unanimous consent which are actually an emergency, I shall object unless they come up on unanimous-consent day.

Mr. LANGLEY. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not object to the next one.

Mr. MANN. I will. It can go over until the next unanimous-consent day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state to all Members that there is a Unanimous Consent Calendar, and it comes up next Monday. These recognitions for unanimous consent are in contravention of the rule that made that calendar, and gentlemen who have these bridge bills had best get busy this morning and put them on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask my colleague from Georgia, merely in the interests of navigation, whether this bridge is above or below the city of Savannah?

Mr. EDWARDS. You might say that it is opposite. It is across Back River. It does not cross the navigable channel, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is a large development going on there now. This will not affect the navigation?

Mr. EDWARDS. Not at all. This is not across the main river. This is across a branch, or slough, that can not be used for navigation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And it is satisfactory to the department?

Mr. EDWARDS. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. And there is no objection there?

Mr. EDWARDS. Not at all. The local people there want it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed House bills of the following titles without amendment:

H. R. 320. An act to authorize the county of Bonner, Idaho, to construct a bridge across Pend Oreille River; and

H. R. 775. An act granting the consent of Congress to J. P. Jones and others to construct one or more bridges across the

Chattahoochee River between the counties of Coweta and Carroll, in the State of Georgia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 2521. An act legalizing certain conveyances heretofore made by the Central Pacific Railroad Co. and others within the State of Nevada.

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV the following Senate bill was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

S. 2521. An act legalizing certain conveyances heretofore made by the Central Pacific Railroad Co. and others within the State of Nevada.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had, on the following dates, approved and signed bill and joint resolutions of the following titles:

December 17, 1915:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to transfer the Government exhibit from the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to the Panama-California Exposition, and for other purposes.

December 18, 1915:

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution extending the time for filing the report of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Fiscal Relations between the District of Columbia and the United States; and

S. 696. An act authorizing the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at Oil City, Venango County, Pa.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes in order to answer what I consider to be an attack against me that was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the 7th of January.

Mr. FERRIS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, would not the gentleman from the Philippines just as soon have the time yielded to him after we get into committee?

Mr. QUEZON. Yes. I would not have any objection to that, Mr. Speaker, but I suppose the gentleman who is credited with having written this article will want to answer me immediately, and I do not know whether he would be able to get the time as soon as I am through speaking.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will get time if you get time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state for the benefit of all concerned that the matter that the gentleman from the Philippines has is in the nature of a question of personal privilege. Of course, not being a Member of the House, he can not get it. He has asked unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the other day when we were fixing time for general debate on the water-power bill we took into consideration time for the gentleman from the Philippines. I think that ought to be sufficient.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say, in answer to the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that they took into consideration the time that the gentleman from the Philippines [Mr. QUEZON] desires to use in addressing the House; they took into consideration also the fact that I perhaps would want an opportunity to answer the gentleman, did they not?

Mr. MANN. We did.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I could not hear the remark made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois—

Mr. SLAYDEN. I could not hear the gentleman from Illinois, and I do not know how it might affect a request that I am going to make to be allowed 10 or 12 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I do not think the gentleman will have any trouble in getting the time from the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers to give to the gentleman from the Philippines any time he wants.

Mr. MANN. We have reached that stage in the proceedings where we have business on hand, and gentlemen will have to take the opportunity of addressing the House, in the main, in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection, or does the gentleman withdraw his request?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Minnesota rise?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I rise to reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objected.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Minnesota objecting?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. He is not. He is reserving the right to object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Did the gentleman from Illinois object?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the gentleman from Illinois has already objected. He exercised his right.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 406.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LOFT, by unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. CONRY, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

COAL AND OIL LEASES.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 406. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 406, known as the coal and oil leasing bill, with Mr. CULLOP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 406, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 406) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is recognized for 40 minutes.

RIGHTS OF NEUTRAL NATIONS TO EXPORT ARMS AND MUNITIONS OF WAR TO BELLIGERENTS.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, during the last few days there has been much discussion on the floor of the House touching the policy of this country in allowing arms and munitions of war to be exported to belligerent nations. In the discussion of that question, as well as other questions concerning our foreign policy, some gentlemen in the heat of debate have said some things which to some of us it seems would have been better if left unsaid. My good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], able, courteous, and courageous, an adept at all times in "starting something," by his remarks of last week so aroused many Representatives to a defense of their constituents that this Chamber has resounded with oratory and eloquence has poured forth as streams run down the mountain side, extolling the character and patriotism of their respective constituencies.

You will pardon me if at this particular time, when our international situation is strained and delicate, I venture the suggestion that it is the part of wisdom not to transform private opinions into public utterances. I have no doubt that each Representative here is equally as zealous as every other Representative of the rights of their constituents and as sincere in their admiration of the good qualities and good intentions of them.

I am quite sure that gentlemen on this floor representing in part German constituencies are as much in love with the patriotic Germans in their districts as is the gentleman from Massachusetts with those sturdy New Englanders who live in his district and have seen fit to return him to this House term after term. Mr. Chairman, I think cases are quite rare when one American citizen, be he of German or French or English extraction, has any feeling or prejudice against American citizens of different extraction; and while possibly some constituents of foreign birth or parentage have their own preference among the nations at war in Europe, I believe, like the President of the United States, that they are few indeed who, in case of war between this country and a foreign country, would fail to put America first.

But, sirs, views expressed by Representatives on this floor, as well as in the other end of the Capitol, are oftentimes exaggerated by the press, and very likely interpreted wrongly by people of other countries. Speeches made upon this floor, criticizing the foreign policy of this Government, are very likely to create in the public mind of foreign nations a very erroneous idea as to the true sentiment and attitude of the American people. And, sirs, may I be permitted to say to those who are prone to attack the foreign policy of this Government, while you may tickle the fancy and win the applause of your respective constituents by taking issue with the men who are directing the foreign affairs of this country, and criticizing their action, you at the same time are clogging the diplomatic wheels of this administration and embarrassing those officials in carrying out and making successful our foreign policy.

No fact connected with the war across the waters is more manifest than that the dissension and discord among the people of England and the criticism directed at the officials in charge of that Government has materially affected the success of English arms. It has been food for the central powers and a tonic to solidify and encourage and enthuse their soldiers in the trenches.

No nation in times of war can obtain success without harmonious, united action upon the part of all the people. Harmonious and united action is likewise conducive to diplomatic success.

This Government has laid down in a most admirable document its policy respecting the exportation of arms and munitions of war to belligerent nations, and speeches on this floor criticizing that policy and accepting the views of foreign nations opposed to it are but giving encouragement to those foreign nations and crippling the sincere and impartial efforts of this Government in maintaining a most just and fair and correct neutral policy.

Because the policy of this Government in refusing to prohibit the exportation of arms and munitions of war to belligerents has been assailed by gentlemen on this floor, I desire to address myself particularly to that subject.

I lay it down as an incontrovertible proposition that with hardly an exception neutral countries which have prohibited free trade in arms and munitions of war with belligerents have done so for one or the other of four reasons: First, in order to discourage insurrections and rebellions, and assist in the maintenance of law and order and stable government. Secondly, in order to prevent a future enemy from acquiring munitions of war or resources to carry on a war against the nation invoking the order. Thirdly, to conserve the military strength of the country. Fourthly, to comply with treaty stipulations.

In the first class I might cite the case of Prussia in prohibiting arms and munitions of war being exported into Poland that revolutions and insurrections might be put down in that country, or I might cite the action of this Government during the administration of Mr. Taft and Mr. Wilson respecting the insurrection in Mexico. Under the second class I refer to the fact that the Christians in olden times enjoined the enemies of all Christendom from obtaining arms and implements of war. The Romans in the early ages prevented in times of peace the sale of war materials to barbarians as eventual and future enemies of Rome.

Under the third class I might cite the case of Austria and Belgium, as well as other nations, which during the Franco-Prussian War prohibited the exportation of horses to the belligerent nations, this object being to conserve the horses of their own country. Why, sirs, in 1862 in our own United States President Lincoln issued this order: "Ordered that no arms, ammunition, or munitions of war be allowed to be exported from the United States until further ordered," and so forth. This action was to conserve the strength of the Union armies and the resources of the North.

Under the fourth class I might cite the fact that as far back as the beginning of the fourteenth century, when commercial relations between individuals began to be developed and the princes, seeing that they had greatly benefited from the commercial enterprises of their subjects, began to negotiate with foreign princes and enter into treaty agreements that in the event of war a contracting nation would not aid nor succor the enemy of the other contracting nation. It was an unfair custom, because it operated to strengthen larger nations at the expense of smaller nations.

England in 1353 bound up by a treaty the Iberian seacoast cities that in the event of war between England and one of the nations of the world these Iberian seacoast cities were prevented from selling anything to the enemies of England that might aid them in the war.

Such unfair propositions were found, too, in the Spanish-England treaty of 1604, the English-Dutch treaty of 1654, the Franco-Danish treaty of 1663, the English-Danish treaty

of 1670, the Franco-Hamburg treaty of 1769, and the Franco-Mecklenburg treaty of 1779.

These positions were so palpably unfair and partial and unjust that the practice has long since been abandoned and discarded by the nations of the world.

It has been the policy of nations and the recognized rule of international law that the subjects of neutral countries have the right to export arms and munitions of war to belligerent nations. In the war for American independence France refused to comply with the request of England to prohibit the exportation of arms to America. In 1793 the United States refused to comply with the wish of England that the former prohibit her citizens from selling arms to French agents; and in that controversy it is interesting to note the note of the then Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, who declared:

Our citizens have always been free to make, vend, and export arms; it is the constant occupation and livelihood of some of them. To suppress their callings—the only means perhaps of their subsistence—because a war exists in foreign and distant country in which we have no concern would scarcely be expected. It would be hard in principle and impossible in practice.

Mr. Charles Lee, as Attorney General of the United States, in January, 1796, in giving an opinion on this question, said:

If the individual citizens of the United States carry on a contraband commerce with either of the belligerent powers, neither can charge it upon the government of the neutral nation as a departure from neutrality, and it is not considered as a duty imposed upon a nation by a state of neutrality to prevent its seamen from employing themselves in contraband trade, nor are there to be shown any instances where a neutral nation has exercised or attempted to exercise its authority in restraining practices or employments of this kind.

The same position was taken shortly afterwards by the English Government, when, owing to the Greco-Turkish War of 1826, the Duke of Wellington demanded the prohibition of the exportation of contraband, and Mr. Canning officially said that the shipment of arms to belligerents was not against the law and that it could not be prohibited at all by the English Government.

In 1842 Daniel Webster, as Secretary of State, in a diplomatic controversy between this Government and Mexico, said:

Trade in articles contraband of war is carried on at the risk of those engaged in it, under the liabilities and penalties prescribed by the law of nations or particular treaties. If it be true, therefore, that citizens of the United States have been engaged in commerce by which Texas, an enemy of Mexico, has been supplied with arms and munitions of war, the Government of the United States nevertheless was not bound to prevent it, could not have prevented it without a manifest departure from the principles of neutrality, and is in nowise answerable for the consequences.

In December, 1855, President Pierce, in his message to Congress, said:

The laws of the United States do not forbid their citizens to sell to either of the belligerent powers articles contraband of war; and although in so doing the individual citizen exposes his property or person to some of the hazards of war, his acts do not involve any breach of national neutrality nor of themselves implicate the Government.

And again, at the beginning of the Franco-Prussian War, U. S. Grant, as President of the United States, declared in his proclamation of August 22, 1870, that the laws of the United States did not interfere with trade in arms and munitions with belligerent nations.

Let me cite you, sirs, to the further fact that Prussia during the Civil War refused to prohibit her citizens from exporting arms and munitions of war to the North or the South, because at that time the representative of the Prussian Government said it would interfere with their trade and commerce. It was during this war that a most flourishing trade in arms with Germany was carried on, because Germany at that time was well supplied with breech-loading guns, which had become superfluous in Germany owing to the introduction of a new make of gun, and they found their way into parts of the North in exchange for the gold of this country.

In 1868 the English Admiralty judge, Lushington, in his official capacity said:

A belligerent has no right to say to a neutral, "You shall help me to strengthen my rights as a belligerent by restricting your own freedom and by making unlawful your own law which was not unlawful before."

And in this connection, Mr. Chairman, it is quite interesting to note the controversy over this question between England and Germany. Germany requested England, through her ambassador, to cease the sale and shipment of munitions of war into France and stated in support of her contention, as shown in the memorandum of September 1, 1870, "that France had maliciously violated the peace between the two countries without any good reason, while Germany was fighting for a good cause," and further stated, "although the shipment of arms to belligerents was in strict form of neutrality, yet the German nation had a right to expect of England under the circum-

stances at least a favoring attitude," insisting, as revealed by the note, "that it was beyond human comprehension that she would not take sides with one party or the other in a struggle like the present one." "What is the use of fighting, right or wrong, in the eyes of the world," says the German memorandum, "if the world remains indifferent to the justice of the cause?" To this note the English ambassador replied that Germany was asking her to do something that she (Germany) had failed to do in the Crimean War, namely, failed to prohibit the exportation of arms and munitions of war from Germany to Russia.

The German ambassador replied that a different political situation was then involved, saying that—

Then there was not a struggle of life and death between two powers of equal importance, but a war in a distant territory and for remote interests, a war of four against one, in which the material existence of England was not jeopardized.

England refused at that time to place an embargo on shipments of arms and munitions of war into France; but it is indeed interesting to note the arguments then advanced by the ambassador of Germany in support of Germany's right to export arms and munitions of war into Russia and the contention now advanced by some in this country as well as some foreign Governments that this country should change its policy at this time in the exportation of arms and munitions of war to the belligerents.

Mr. STERLING. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. What did Germany do in the Spanish-American War? Did Germany sell munitions of war to Spain?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; Germany in the Spanish-American War did traffic in arms and munitions of war, even though at that time she was a neutral power.

Mr. STERLING. Did this country request them not to do so?

Mr. HARRISON. It did not.

And in following the practices of neutral nations in the exportation of arms and munitions of war to belligerents down to the present day we find that Germany and Austria and England, as well as many other of the European nations, during the Russo-Turkish War exported to a more or less extent arms and munitions of war to one or the other of the belligerents.

In the Russo-Japanese War, as well as in the war between Italy and Turkey, again Germany and Austria and England sold to either one or the other of the warring nations. In the Balkan War no industries flourished quite as much nor greater wealth from any other source came to Germany as through the manufacture and sale of arms and munitions of war to one or the other of the Balkan States. And again, sirs, in the Boer War, while England, the proud and strong, patrolled the coasts of southern Africa, preventing the heroic Boers from obtaining munitions of war from any nation, Germany as well as other neutral powers exported arms and munitions of war to this mighty mistress of the seas.

And so it has been, Mr. Chairman, that throughout the history of nations, by precedent on precedent, the very correct policy now being pursued by this Government respecting the exportation of arms and munitions of war to belligerents has been upheld, and it seems to me, in view of this array of precedents showing the unbroken custom of neutral nations, that it is going very far indeed for citizens of America to criticize and find fault with this, the established policy of the Government.

I shall not devote any time in this presentation to a discussion of a change of our established policy being construed by any nation now at war as an unneutral act, but I am very clearly of the opinion that where nations have relied on the custom of neutral nations to practice freedom of trade in arms and munitions of war with belligerents, if that custom should be changed in time of war—during a war—it could be construed, and with more justification, as an unneutral act than for a belligerent to construe our present policy as one of unneutrality.

Neither shall I devote in this presentation any time to a discussion of the question whether a change from our present policy would necessitate a constant preparedness for war on our part. Suffice it to say that I am quite sure if we as a Nation knew that in case of war we would be prevented from buying arms and munitions of war from the neutral nations of the world, that the people of America would demand from us an adequate supply of war material, to be continually manufactured and constantly kept on hand. The question of preparedness would then, in my opinion, be a livelier and greater question before the American people than is now dreamed of by the most radical militarists.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are other reasons than those I have already stated why a change in our policy on this im-

portant question would be embarrassing and confusing. In the first place, the question would be asked, What would you include in the term "contraband of war"? The nations of the world have never been able to agree on what is contraband of war. The nearest approach to it was embodied in the declaration of London; but that declaration was never ratified by all of the great nations of the world, and could not be applied in this immediate case.

What a gentleman from Missouri might desire to include in the list as contraband articles might not meet the approval of other Representatives here. He would doubtless feel that horses and mules from Missouri, for instance, which are necessary in the conduct of a war, should not be included in the list of things contraband of war. He would certainly feel the same interest relative to protecting, in so far as his constituents sell at a profit, that which they are most interested in, as I would be desirous—or any other Member on the floor of this House would be desirous—of preventing an embargo on some things raised or articles made in my district which are used in modern warfare.

There is hardly anything now raised or made that does not enter more or less into modern warfare. Things which to-day are innocent may become to-morrow indispensable for war purposes. The marvelous development of chemistry and mechanics make necessary the greatest revolutions in the technique of war in the shortest time.

One of the important questions with which we have had to contend since the war has been the British order in council placing cotton on the contraband list. Due to that action alone, the section from which I hail has lost on its cotton crop alone hundreds of millions of dollars. I am quite sure, therefore, that the people of my section are more interested in having the embargo lifted from cotton, so that it can move into all the ports of the world, than they are in seeing legislation enacted that would further hamper its sale and cripple the industry.

And what applies to cotton in my section applies with equal force to those sections which produce copper and coal and iron ore and foodstuffs, or from those sections that raise horses and mules and cattle, or those that manufacture aeroplanes, automobiles, cannon and other arms and munitions of war.

But, Mr. Chairman, greater confusion than this would arise if, because of the strength of the allies' navy, this embargo should be ordered to insure equality among the warring nations; then, as very aptly stated by the Secretary of State in his note to Austria-Hungary on August 22, 1915, it could be contended with equal fairness that—

A belligerent who lacks the necessary munitions to contend successfully on land ought to be permitted to purchase them from neutrals, while a belligerent with an abundance of war stores or with the power to produce them should be debarred from such traffic.

It would, sirs, compel this country to sit in judgment and study and watch every movement of every army of the belligerents to keep accurately the number of men enlisted, furloughed, killed, captured, or wounded; the amount of arms and ammunition manufactured, imported, used, captured, or destroyed; to ascertain the condition of crops, the amount of land tilled, products raised, and goods manufactured or imported; in short, to keep informed about everything and every incident that might weaken or strengthen one or the other of the contending forces, so that this country, then, in order to show perfect fairness and equality of action might make or rescind orders that would either strengthen or weaken the resources of the belligerent nations.

It would—

As very pertinently stated by Secretary Lansing—

involve this Nation in a mass of perplexities which would obscure the whole field of international obligation, produce economic confusion, and deprive all commerce and industry of legitimate fields of enterprise.

Sirs, the best course for this Nation as a neutral power to pursue is the course which it has pursued, namely, respecting all the rights of belligerents, but demanding under established international law the observance of every neutral right. [Applause.]

Sirs, speaking not as a partisan but as an American, I have faith and confidence in the judgment and wisdom and patriotism of President Wilson and Secretary of State Lansing, and as one member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House I shall never vote for, but shall persistently oppose, the enactment of any law that would prohibit the freedom of this a neutral Nation in the exportation of arms and munitions of war to the belligerent nations of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] not more than 15 minutes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, because I do not like the society of powder magazines, nor association with dynamite bombs, it has been with great reluctance that I have got my own consent to say a few words about conditions in Mexico, conditions which I am convinced are loaded to overflowing with danger and trouble.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the depressing influence which I feel to-day, and which reminds me of those days just preceding the Spanish War, when there was the same nervous, tense anxiety in this House that there is to-day, is not well founded. It is because I do not like to handle such dangerous subjects, Mr. Chairman, and, further, because I always try to compress to an irreducible minimum whatever I have to say in this House that I have reduced my few remarks, which will take but a few minutes, to writing.

I think the conference between the Secretary of State and the diplomatic representatives of six Spanish-American Governments did well to advise the recognition of Venustiano Carranza as the head of whatever government exists in Mexico and that the President did the proper—and at the time the only possible thing—in adopting the suggestion.

Since the enforced retirement of Huerta Mexico has been the bloody theater of contending factions, doing all sorts of crimes, from assaults on women and murder to the looting of banks, all in the name of liberty. It was an intolerable condition, and some one had to be recognized. Somewhere and on some one the responsibilities of government had to lodge. The choice lay between Carranza and Villa, the unspeakable.

Since these troubles began, Mr. Chairman, I have tried to do my duty as a citizen and a Representative in Congress by keeping quiet and leaving the whole matter in the hands of the President and the Secretary of State. I have been silent even when I thought serious mistakes were being made, and have not hesitated to express my approval after the fact when I thought the right thing had been done. I am not on my feet to-day for the purpose of criticizing anyone. I am venturing to speak a few words to-day because I feel that it is a duty I owe my State, my section of the State, the people of the border, and my conscience. In a broader way, sir, it is a duty I owe the whole country, for I shall venture a warning, which, if heeded, may avoid trouble for the people of Maine as well as the people of Texas, Arizona, and California.

Horrors in Mexico are cumulative. Who has forgotten the outrages at Durango, when a city was destroyed; the murders in the Cumbre Tunnel, when innocent men, women, and children were shot, burned, and suffocated by a bandit who, on the border, was known to be a confederate in crime of Doroteo Arango, otherwise and worse known as Pancho Villa? Some of you may have forgotten that the particular thief and murderer who executed this horror fled to the United States, where he was arrested and confined in a stockade at Fort Bliss, which is near El Paso. In this so-called imprisonment he was better fed and cared for than ever in his whole worthless and criminal life, and after a few months was released.

Americans have been murdered singly and in squads. They have been shot when going peacefully about their business in Mexico and even on their own territory. They have mysteriously disappeared and never been heard of again. Those of us who live on or near the border have a distinct idea of their fate.

They have even invaded our territory under military command, and with a semblance of organization, killing Americans and stealing their property.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the border have been patient under an unparalleled series of outrages. They do not want war with Mexico, but they do want security for their lives and property. Their patience is nearly exhausted, and if some relief, absolute, reliable, and continued, is not quickly given them they may not always remain patient. Their anger is great and growing. I deplore any rash action on their part, and I sincerely, fervently hope there will be none, but he must be blind who can not see the danger.

I believe in Pan Americanism. I have pleaded for it for years. I believe that it will, when properly developed and faithfully lived up to, bring a better understanding and more cordial relations. I believe that a corollary of it will be an effective means of preventing the recurrence of such conditions as those that have disgraced and ruined Mexico. When the internal affairs of any Republic in either of the Americas become a scandal and a nuisance, when the offensive odors of them cross international lines, and the cries of the victims fall on the ears of neighbors, threatening the peace of other countries, a Pan-American union could and should end them.

The Pan-American spirit is new. As yet it is a sentiment. But it can be quickly translated into international law, which so often has been born of circumstances and the necessities of humanity. It has come much earlier than expected, but has not the time actually arrived when, if peace is to be maintained, it should be invoked and vigorously applied?

Again I say that horror piled on horror, crime treading on the heels of crime, have exhausted the patience of the people of the border States, and they will be satisfied with nothing short of the capture and execution of the murderers of the 16 Americans who are the latest victims of anarchy which has gone on for five years. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there is an ugly story, in connection with this crime, to the effect that these Americans, who were going back to Mexico to their regular work and who relied on the de facto government for protection, asked for and were refused a military escort. I hope it is not true. If it is, it will show that the Government of Mexico is indifferent to its obligations, unfaithful to the trust we gave them with recognition.

There is also a story, and this I believe, that Villa gave an order a few weeks ago to his bandit followers "to kill all Americans, burn and loot." Whether he gave the order or not it has been done.

Again I venture to say that the rising anger of Americans on the border is dangerous and can not be trifled with. [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON].

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, on January 7 there was inserted in the Senate proceedings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article alleged to have been written by a Member of this House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN]. On the following day the distinguished Senator who had had this article inserted requested—and the request was granted by the Senate—that the paragraph of this article which refers to me be stricken from the permanent RECORD. To this paragraph I wish to call the attention of the House. The paragraph says:

The Governor General, the other part of the lawmaking and appointing machine, has publicly proclaimed his indebtedness to MANUEL QUEZON for his appointment, and QUEZON is the leader of the movement to throw off so-called American "oppression and tyranny," and is the accredited custodian of the Philippine campaign fund, said to reach many thousands of dollars, collected in the islands for some time from the servants, clerks, officeholders, merchants, and others to "influence Congress" to pass the Jones or any other old bill providing for "independence." Money can not put legislation through Congress, and any statement that it is used to control Senators or Members is a slander to our national lawmakers and an imposition upon the innocent and confiding ones who give up their hard-earned money for said purpose. The Congress would render a public service, vindicate its Members, and protect hundreds of poor, needy, and innocent people by putting an end to the collection of this fund to "influence Congress." An investigation should be made to ascertain all the facts, who originated the scheme, the names and occupations of all subscribers, whether voluntary or forced contributions, the amounts, method of collection, how the funds are distributed, and names of persons to whom paid, etc.

Mr. Chairman, I confess that what I have read sounds rather ugly to me; but, being conscious of my limited knowledge of the intricacies of the English language, I am withholding judgment until I am positive that I know the impression that was intended to be conveyed to the reader by the author of these statements. Is it alleged or suggested that I or any other person authorized by me or any other person, with my knowledge, was engaged in collecting money in the Philippine Islands avowedly for the purpose of using this money to control Senators and Representatives? Is it alleged or suggested that any person in the Philippine Islands, under my authority or with my knowledge, has been collecting funds, informing the people from whom this money was collected that such funds were to be used in the United States for the purpose of controlling Senators and Representatives, and that I, knowing that this money has been so collected, have taken that money, kept it in my possession, used it for that purpose, or for my own personal ends, or have not used it at all?

Mr. Chairman, I have been holding the position of Resident Commissioner for the last five years, and I can say before God and man that my hand and my conscience are not only clean of any stain of improper conduct in the performance of my duties, but that I have done everything that I could to promote the interest that I was called upon to defend as I saw the path indicated by my duty. [Applause.] I want to know if now or ever I have done anything with Members of either House of this Congress that would indicate that I was attempting unduly to influence their minds in favor of the cause that I am representing here? If it is an improper action to argue with Members of Congress my views on the Philippine question, if it is illegitimate for me to act toward Members of Congress as one gentleman should act toward another, then I confess

most willingly that I am guilty of improper action. If it is a crime to come here and advocate independence or any other policy that in my opinion should be advocated in the interest of my people, if it is a crime to propagate my views, if it is a crime to appeal to the hearts and minds of Members, then I am guilty. But, Mr. Chairman, if there is any suggestion that I have endeavored to promote the cause that I represent by attempting improperly to influence Members of Congress by the use of money or in any other way, if there be such suggestions, I want to say that it is a slander upon me without the slightest foundation in fact. [Applause.]

There is a committee in the Philippine Islands composed of men prominent in their professions, in business, and in the government service which for some time has been collecting money, and the treasurer of this committee is Mr. Thomas Earnshaw, a brother of my colleague, the other Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands, who is a wealthy and an honest man. Actually the amount of money collected monthly amounts to about the large sum of \$500. This money was collected for the purpose of sending out literature to propagate the views of those who believed in Philippine independence. Is it improper to use money for the purpose of informing the American people as to conditions really existing in the Philippine Islands? The only thing wrong about it, I think, Mr. Chairman, is that the sum is so ridiculously small in amount that very little can be done with it. I wish that instead of \$500 a month we had thousands of dollars a month. We then could and would be sending books to every household in this country, written by eminent and distinguished Filipinos, especially the books of Dr. Rizal, so that the American people might know that there are intelligent and able men in the Philippine Islands. We could and would have been sending photographs to every corner of this country, not of naked Igorots, which have been freely distributed in the past, leading the American people to believe that we are all naked, uncivilized men in the Philippine Islands, but photographs of our wonderful and old churches, that speak of our Christian civilization lasting 300 years; of our schools and colleges, both during the Spanish and the American régime, that would speak of our education; of our houses, that would speak of our social life. We should be using that money not to control Members of Congress but to inform the American people as to our state of civilization and as to our desires, so that the American public, which in the last resort has the final voice on the Philippine question, may intelligently pass upon that subject. Is there anything wrong about that?

Mr. Chairman, I wish it could be ascertained how much money has been expended to propagate views contrary to Philippine independence, how much money has been expended to issue literature describing conditions in the Philippine Islands that contain statements reflecting upon the Filipino people. And yet I do not criticize that campaign. Any man has a right to present his views before the American people.

A book written two years ago by Dean C. Worcester, who was secretary of the interior in the Philippine Islands, quite an expensive book, which has been distributed freely throughout this country, and Members of this House have received it, not knowing where it came from. This book is opposed to independence and some one paid the price for its free distribution. Is there anything wrong about that?

Mr. Chairman, not a cent of that so-called Philippine campaign fund is spent without the knowledge of my colleague [Mr. EARNSHAW], who is sitting here, and myself, and Mr. EARNSHAW knows as well as I do that not a cent of that money has been ever used or attempted to be used to control Members of Congress of either House. [Applause.] Surely it has not been used to enrich myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. How much more time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. QUEZON. Can I have 10 minutes more? There are more things I would like to call to the attention of the House.

Mr. FERRIS. See if you can not conclude in five minutes. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. QUEZON. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I rise to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], in view of the vast importance of this subject to the gentleman whose integrity has been impeached, or at least attacked, in the public prints repeatedly during this last summer, and in view of the importance of the subject to his

countrymen, 8,000 miles away, if he can not yield 10 minutes additional at this time?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I will take five minutes away from the committee, and I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from the Philippines is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. QUEZON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been in public life almost ever since I left college. I come from a very modest family in a very small town in the Philippines. There is not a human being in the town where I was born who does not know me and my people. I was elected as governor of my Province in 1905. It has been repeatedly stated, and it is suggested in another part of the article that I am commenting upon, that I am a politician; meaning, I suppose, that I am very much interested in a political machine which has been promoting my political career and whose interest I have been promoting. I can say right here and now, in answer to all those attacks, that I have never been elected to any public office by any political machine. I was elected governor of the Province of Tayabas as an independent candidate, and I was opposed by the two political parties in that Province, each of which had a candidate of its own.

After I was elected governor I entered the Nationalist Party. Why? It was my duty to promote the interests of my Province and I wanted to be associated with those people who thought as I did, whose counsels I desired, and in whose integrity and honesty I had confidence. After having served some time as governor I resigned this position to become a candidate for the assembly. Upon presenting my candidacy to the assembly I withdrew from the party once more, not wishing to be elected through the use of any political machinery. I presented my candidacy as an independent. And, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that while I had a hard fight to become governor, because I was not well known in my Province, I did not have to fight at all to be elected to the assembly. Having been governor of Tayabas for a year and a half and the people having had an opportunity to learn all about me and my public work, I was unanimously elected, by every voter in my district. [Applause.] I say unanimously because my opponent received only the votes of his immediate relatives, 20 or 30 persons.

Once in the assembly, I again joined the Nationalist Party—the party whose principles I believed in. I did it not because I wanted to advance my political career, but because I could not play a solo by myself. [Laughter.] If I was to write or help write legislation, I had to cooperate with and have the cooperation of those who thought as I did. After serving some time in the assembly I was elected floor leader, and two years later to the position I now hold. I have been twice unanimously reelected by both houses of our legislature. It is true that I am now and have been for some time one of the leaders of the Nationalist Party, but I have had very little to do with the purely local political campaigns of the party. Here is what the article I refer to says of me on this subject:

QUEZON is one of the Commissioners from the islands to the American Congress, is very much in politics, and naturally anxious to place as many of his partisans on the Government pay roll as possible.

It is suggested that I have been asking Gov. Gen. Harrison to appoint my political followers in the Philippine Islands. Had I done this, there would have been nothing wrong about it, but the truth is that I do not owe the governor a single appointment. It has been stated that Gov. Gen. Harrison publicly acknowledged his indebtedness to me for his appointment as Governor General. Nothing, Mr. Chairman, could please me more than to be able to tell my people that I am of such importance in this country that I can secure the appointment of a Governor General on my mere dictum. [Applause.] Unfortunately, I can not say that, because it is not true. To my knowledge Gov. Gen. Harrison has never made such a statement. I know he has not said it in my presence. True, he has stated that he was gratified to learn that I was in favor of his appointment. But, Mr. Chairman, if it is true that the opinion of the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands is consulted by the President of the United States or by any other officer of this Government on any question of importance affecting the islands, nothing could be more proper than that they should do so. What are we supposed to be here for? Why do we represent the Philippines in the United States? [Applause.]

Are we supposed to come here and draw \$7,500 a year, plus \$2,000 for mileage, simply to sit around and look pretty? [Laughter.] The position of Resident Commissioner was created by an act of the Congress of the United States for the purpose of giving the Filipino people an opportunity to be represented

before the departments of this Government, executive as well as legislative. If you read the language of the law you will see this is a fact. Is it a crime that our advice is sought? Is it a crime for use to volunteer our opinion on matters affecting the islands? Mr. Chairman, I will say right now that if I am supposed to be in the United States only to draw salary, and can not express what I believe to be the rights of my people; if I can not object to or indorse an appointment for the government of the Philippine Islands, then I want to resign my post, for I should be ashamed to receive my salary; I should want to go home, because I do not see what good I could do here. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the Philippines has again expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, before I proceed any further I want to say this: If it is suggested that I have done something wrong, or authorized anyone to do something wrong, in connection with my work in this country, I shall welcome an investigation. But I do not want to see it used to delay Philippine legislation, or to divert the minds of the American people from the real issue that is before them.

There is another statement in this article about which I want to say a few words, and I am going to read it as fast as I can. The gentleman from Tennessee says of me:

Having served in the revolutionary army against the United States, we can imagine he is not shedding tears when the political guillotine decapitates former American soldiers in the interest of his political supporters—

And so on.

Mr. Chairman, there is a suggestion here that I want to refute. It is hinted at, that because I have served in the Philippine Army I am holding rancor in my heart toward American veterans. My best American friends in the Philippine Islands are men against whom I fought during the war. [Applause.] I have the greatest admiration for Americans who, in answer to the call of their country, have gone to the Philippine Islands and fought us, just as I believe—at least, I hope—that those Americans admire the Filipinos who had the courage to fight them. [Applause.] There is no rancor in my heart. These men were doing their duty as I knew I was doing my duty. They tried to kill me during the war, and I tried to kill them. [Laughter.] But men who have enough red blood in their veins to come out and fight for their country have big enough hearts to respect those against whom they are fighting. [Applause.]

I want to say this again: My best American friends in the islands are Judge Ross, who was a captain of Volunteers and a Democrat, and Maj. Hartigan, a Republican. I could recite a long list of others, but that would take up too much of the time of the House.

Mr. Chairman, my advocacy of independence is not inspired by rancor or ill will toward Americans, but by love of freedom. The day will yet come when it will be seen that I have been a good friend of the Americans in the Philippine Islands, that I have looked after their interests there as I am looking after the interests of my country here. The day will yet come when it will be demonstrated that in advocating the independence of my country I have been moved by high motives, just as I give credit for good motives to those who are taking an attitude opposed to mine.

Good name in man and woman, dear my lord,
Is the immediate jewel of their souls;
Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something, nothing;
'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands;
But he that filches from me my good name
Robs me of that which not enriches him
And makes me poor indeed.

[Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma has consumed all of his time.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I take full responsibility for the article or letter published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the 7th day of the present month. I am responsible for every page of it, every line of it, and every word of it. When I penned it I knew I had back of it information which could not be challenged.

I have been exceedingly careful since I have been a Member of this House in being accurate and truthful in what I have said to my colleagues and to the country. I have no apologies to make for any statement in the letter or article, and when the opportunity comes for a discussion of the Philippine bill, then I will go more into detail.

I ask the Commissioner now who has just addressed the House if he knows Newton W. Gilbert, of Manila?

Mr. QUEZON. I do.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is he a truthful and honorable gentleman? Will the gentleman stand up and answer?

Mr. QUEZON. That is a question, Mr. Chairman, that I can not answer until a concrete question as to what Newton W. Gilbert has done or said is put to me.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is your answer, then?

Mr. QUEZON. Yes; that is my answer.

Mr. AUSTIN. He served in this House from the great State of Indiana, and he had a clean and an honorable record. He was afterwards appointed on account of his fitness and his character to a high judicial office in the Philippines by Theodore Roosevelt. Later he was made a commissioner and the vice governor of the Philippine Islands; and if the gentleman here representing the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON] can not testify to his high standing and credibility, every honorable American in the Philippine Islands who knows him will testify to it, and his colleagues with whom he lately served in this House will certify to his truthfulness and his high character.

I based this statement, to which the gentleman takes exception, on a conversation with Newton W. Gilbert, in which conversation he said when he asked the Resident Commissioner [Mr. QUEZON] for what purpose he was using this money, collected according to the statements of Army officers, some of whom I have known for many years, from their servants, from merchants, officeholders, and employees of cigar factories, his reply was that he was using it to influence Congress in the passage of legislation looking to the independence of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Not now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. According to ex-Gov. Gilbert's statement, he asked the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON] how he was influencing Congress, and the gentleman named one instance, namely, that he gave a banquet at the Metropolitan Club and issued 57 invitations to the Members of Congress, and every invitation was accepted, and according to this statement that was one of the methods by which the gentleman [Mr. QUEZON] was using this campaign fund to influence the Members of Congress.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. AUSTIN. Not in 10 minutes. If the gentleman from Wisconsin will get me more time—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I will yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman now permit a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I will be very glad to if the gentleman will be as anxious to have me given time as he was to have time given to the gentleman who represents the Philippine Islands.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move that in some way we give the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee 10 minutes additional.

Mr. FERRIS. I make the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is already allotted and a motion of that kind will not be in order.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he was at the banquet at the Metropolitan Club?

Mr. AUSTIN. I was not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I was there; and Gov. Gilbert, of whom the gentleman speaks, was there. Not only that, but a gentleman whose name I have forgotten, but I think his name was Martin, and who was at that time an official in the Philippine Islands, was the man in whose honor the banquet was given, and he occupied the seat of honor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Martin is the present Vice Governor General, who comes from the State of Kansas?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It was in his honor that it was given.

Mr. AUSTIN. Well, then, according to the statement which Gov. Gilbert says Mr. QUEZON made, the gentleman from Wis-

consin [Mr. COOPER] is one of the Members of Congress influenced by a dinner at the Metropolitan Club. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman—

Mr. AUSTIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, no more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I know since that banquet the gentleman from Wisconsin has been very enthusiastic for Philippine independence [laughter], and he has been exceedingly desirous to have the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON] talk all the morning. I think it was a good investment, as far as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] was concerned. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. AUSTIN. You must get me some more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] yield the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] some more time?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, in this article there is not an intimation, there is nothing upon which the talented gentleman from the Philippines could construe even indirectly a suggestion that he retained any of this money. There is no question but what the gentleman had a right to use this money in a campaign of publicity.

When this remark was repeated to me as coming from the gentleman [Mr. QUEZON], stated to a man whose credibility stands as high in the city of Manila as the gentleman who has just addressed the House, and the gentleman knows it, I thought it my duty, in writing my experiences and observations in the Philippine Islands—I thought it my duty to my colleagues in the House—to repeat that statement, and I did it in the letter or article published in the RECORD on January 7.

I am glad the gentleman has an opportunity to go before the American people with his campaign of publicity. I want him given every opportunity in this House, for freedom of speech is an American blessing; but the gentleman knows that when I attempted to exercise my right in the Philippine Islands to voice my judgment and my opinion he criticized me in an interview in the Manila papers for daring to discuss political questions in the Philippine Islands, questions affecting not only the Filipino people, but vitally affecting more than 5,000 Americans in the islands, Americans who have invested \$100,000,000 to develop the gentleman's country, to bring it prosperity and blessings, and to give employment to the natives at increased wages.

Why, the gentleman objected to an interview I gave out and sent me a message requesting, in my future utterances, to tone them down to suit him. He carried our congressional party to a native banquet, and we listened in the public streets and in a banquet hall to seven or eight speeches, all delivered in Spanish, without an interpreter, and the gentleman delivered one of these speeches 25 minutes in Spanish and 5 minutes in the English language. A political discussion in a language unknown to three or four Members of this House, without an interpreter. The speeches were on the Jones bill and the independence of the Philippine Islands. The gentleman reserved to himself the exclusive right of discussing in our presence, in a foreign language, political questions in the Philippine Islands, and yet criticized and sought to prevent me, as an American citizen, from expressing my honest sentiments in the public press on this great question, involving the future welfare and happiness of 8,000,000 native people and more than 5,000 splendid Americans in the Philippine Islands, whose property would be destroyed as in Mexico, whose lives would be endangered as in Mexico, whenever the American Army and Navy leave the islands, and the fate of Americans there placed in the hands of the Filipino people, untrained and unfitted for civil government. Their leader proved to me he was opposed to freedom of speech unless the utterances were in accord with his views and his opinions.

He speaks of his election as governor of a Province. A governor in that Province afterwards appealed to the Philippine people that there was more American blood upon his sword, or bolo, than upon that of any of his rival candidates, and for that reason he was entitled to win, and he was elected.

Mr. QUEZON. Is the gentleman referring to me?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; not to you.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EVANS. In the discussion of this question it appears to me that the rules of the House ought to be strictly observed and that a Member ought not to be spoken to in the second person.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is right; it is improper to address any Member in the second person, and the Member should rise and first address the Chair.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, is it not a breach of the rules to talk back to the Chairman without obtaining permission from the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has said that it was against the rules to address any Member without first addressing the Chair.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, Messrs. MILLER, BRITTON, EDWARDS, and BRUMBAUGH, were all in the Philippine Islands during the past summer. In the interest of fair play, in the interest of patriotism and just legislation, would that every Member of this House could visit the Philippine Islands. If they were to visit those islands, not under an escort of native politicians, but given an opportunity to go with the local American business men of standing and character, and study the conditions in the Philippine Islands—if they would do that, no American Member of Congress would ever return here and say that the Philippine people were prepared for self-government. If Members of Congress would do that, they would come back knowing that it would be a crime on the part of the American Government to turn them loose to be captured and controlled by Japan.

Mr. RUCKER. Why do not those Americans come home?

Mr. AUSTIN. We invited them to go there and spend a hundred million dollars, and now my colleague from Missouri sends them the same unpatriotic message that Mr. Wilson sent to Americans in Mexico. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I deny that. The gentleman ought to be careful in his remarks.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understood the gentleman to say that they ought to come back.

Mr. RUCKER. I do if the conditions are as the gentleman describes them; why do they not come home? Why do they not get out?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is the same message which Mr. Wilson sent to Americans in Mexico.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON] one minute.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make the statement that I have never said or intimated to Mr. Newton W. Gilbert that I try to influence Members of Congress by inviting them to dinner. The statement is so ridiculous that I do not think it needs an answer. I have invited Members of Congress to dinner and I have been invited to dinner by them. I was a guest of a Member of Congress yesterday who is against Philippine independence. Perhaps he was trying to influence me and make me change my attitude. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, my personal friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], who has just addressed the House, has been a Member of the House during the entire period that I have. I believe he is as well known to the membership of the House as any man in it, and every man here knows that he is fearless, strong, vigorous, and honest; that what he says he believes to be right and that what he does he believes to be the proper thing to do. I also know that among the predominant traits of his nature is the splendid characteristic of treating justly and fairly all questions and all persons, no matter what the situation, no matter where the place. He would not by implication or by the strained twist of any language he chanced to use ever be put in the position of doing an injustice or departing a hair's breadth from the exact truth. He has expressed his position this morning, and his earnestness testifies to his deep sincerity.

I now wish to join with him in that part of his remarks wherein he stated that his quoted words do not imply misappropriation of campaign funds on the part of the Philippine Resident Commissioner. I exceedingly regret that there has been given to the discussion at this time any suggestions of a somewhat personal nature. Responding to the same impulses that characterize my friend from Tennessee, I honestly feel that I ought to say a word in reference to the Resident Commissioner [Mr. QUEZON].

I have had an opportunity of knowing him well and intimately from the first day he set foot on Washington soil. His office was directly across the hall from my own for a period of three years. During that time and since I have been intimately associated and connected with investigations of Philippine affairs and with practically all the people who are interested in that subject. I have watched and studied with the utmost care the activities and movements calculated to further the cause of Philippine independence. I have carefully noted both in this country and in the Philippines the work of Commissioner QUEZON, and have specifically inquired into the things he stands

for at home as well as here in America. I believe it is but fair to him to say, with full knowledge of the facts, that he has given the cause to which he has devoted himself the fullness of his heart's devotion, the utmost of his unusual talent, and every cent he could personally contribute or has ever received to be employed for that purpose. [Applause.]

In fact, from my standpoint, I think he has labored too hard and too successfully, in that he has created in this country a more favorable view of Philippine independence among many sincere people than circumstances really warrant. In this work he has been greatly aided by his courteous and gentlemanly manner, by his pleasing address, and by the power of the facile orator possessed by him in so eminent a degree.

At home in the Philippines he has great power among his people, partly because of these qualities I have mentioned, partly because he is their national representative in the propaganda for independence, and partly because they know that he is not only an able but also an honest man.

I thus speak of him, Mr. Chairman, because it is his due, and in order that there may be effectively removed any possible suspicion relative to the exact meaning of the words employed by my friend from Tennessee.

I know about this fund and have known about it for two or three years. I agree with my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] that all political propaganda requires publicity, in the Philippine Islands as well as in the United States or elsewhere in the world, and legitimate collections and expenditures therefor no one can severely criticize. I am not in sympathy with some of the objects sought to be attained by this particular propaganda. The gentleman knows that full well; so does the membership of this House. I believe all agitations for immediate independence in the Philippine Islands, or at any time in the near future, is most injurious to the welfare and well-being of the Filipino people. Yet I feel it but fair to those Filipinos who do believe in early independence that they have the opportunity of expressing to the people of the United States the convictions and opinions that they entertain. But having in mind the activities of the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON] during the last five years, both in America and in the Philippines, I am quite amazed that he has accomplished as much as he has even by combining with the funds contributed his own salary and mileage. To the cause of Philippine independence Señor QUEZON has devoted not only his heart but also every resource at his command. His service has been that of complete and honest devotion.

So I believe my friend from Tennessee was right when he said that neither the Resident Commissioner's hands nor his conscience are in the least tainted by any misapplication or misuse of any of the funds contributed by his countrymen. I believe firmly from the bottom of my heart they have all been utilized for the purpose for which they were dedicated, and in ways entirely legitimate. I attended the dinner at the Metropolitan Club that has been discussed. It was in honor of high officials of the insular government of the Philippines, and to it, as I understood, all members of the Insular Affairs Committees of both House and Senate were invited as a mark of courtesy and without any political consideration or purpose. I believe I know every Filipino of prominence now active in public or business life. I have visited every corner of the Philippine Islands, some places several times. I think I know and understand the Filipino people pretty well. I believe it is but fair to say that Mr. QUEZON—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can I not have another minute?

Mr. LENROOT. I regret that I have no more time to yield.

Mr. FERRIS. I yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman. I believe it is but just to the gentleman to say that, in my honest judgment, he has accomplished more for the cause to which he is devoted by reason of his peculiar talents and capacity than could be accomplished by any other Filipino or group of Filipinos that could be named. He is par excellence the man for the work. The Filipino people are rapidly developing, and already comprise many splendid men and women. Señor QUEZON is one of the very best of them all. If all of his people to-day possessed his talents and capabilities, or those of his splendid colleague, Señor EARNSHAW, no man could look into their faces and deny their capacity to maintain a government of their own.

Señor QUEZON rose, a poor boy from a poor family, in a poor town, to become a leader of his race. For this splendid achievement he should be thankful to the God that gave him talents and grateful to the Stars and Stripes, the flag that shelters and

protects free institutions, under whose folds alone can be found opportunity for such a career.

With one possible exception I believe Señor QUEZON is the most influential Filipino among the people of his race. He has attained to this degree of eminence by his ability and conduct, and especially by his courage. No other Filipino of my acquaintance has his courage to entertain and express opinions that may not be popular with his people. He has come to be a conservative, steady factor among his people, and to my personal knowledge the American Government in the Philippines has been indebted to him for true loyalty and efficient support. While he was, of course, a soldier of the revolution, being a Tagalog, and living where the revolution was rampant, nevertheless, since the oath of allegiance was taken there has never been any faltering or wavering on his part in utmost devotion and allegiance to the sovereignty of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] or my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] to give me a few minutes in which to reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. FERRIS. Will not two minutes be enough?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I trust that the gentleman can let me have five minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Debate was closed by unanimous consent, and I have promised the time to other speakers. I can let the gentleman have three minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman at my right [Mr. LENROOT] says that he will give me two minutes if the gentleman from Oklahoma will give me three.

Mr. FERRIS. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, because of the statement by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] that ever since that dinner [laughter] I have been very strongly in favor of granting the Filipinos immediate independence, I desire to call his attention to the fact—although it is a fair inference from his remarks that he does not deem the facts to be material—that what I said when the Philippine bill was under consideration on October 2, 1914, shows that on the question of independence for the islands, my position is very different from what one would be led to think from his statement. I hold in my hand the RECORD of that date:

Mr. Chairman, I would not to-day vote to give to the Philippines immediate, absolute independence. I do not know that 20 years from now I would be prepared to vote to grant them absolute independence. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Oklahoma declare in effect that we are never to give freedom to the Filipino people, and that we are forever to retain the Philippine Islands. This has raised an issue never before injected into the politics of this country, an issue of transcendent importance for us thoroughly to understand. In this connection I invite attention to the words of an acknowledged master of constitutional law, Judge Thomas M. Cooley:

"The Constitution was made for the States, not for the Territories. It confers power to govern Territories, but in exercising this the United States is a sovereign dealing with dependent territory according as in its wisdom shall seem politic, wise, and just, having regard to its own interests as well as to those of the people of the Territories. * * *

"In this dependence of the Territories upon the Central Government there is some outward resemblance to the condition of the American Colonies under the British Crown; but there are some differences which are important, and indeed vital. The first of these is that the Territorial condition is understood under the Constitution to be merely temporary and preparatory, and the people of the Territories while it continues are assured of the right to create and establish State institutions for themselves so soon as the population shall be sufficient and the local conditions suitable, while the British colonial system contained no promise or assurance of any but a dependent government indefinitely."

In this quotation from Judge Cooley we see that great master of constitutional law declaring that under the Constitution of the United States the territorial condition is merely "temporary and preparatory," and that the Constitution holds out to the people in the dependent Territories the promise that when population is sufficient and local conditions suitable they shall be granted statehood. Are we prepared to say that 8,000,000 of Filipinos, 8,000 miles across the ocean, shall be granted statehood, shall be permitted to send two representatives to the Senate of the United States, and 35 or more Representatives to vote on this floor? That was and is the question. And I voted for the preamble then before the House because I did not believe then, as I do not believe now, that the people of this

Republic ever will make the Philippines a State in the great American Commonwealth. [Applause.] Therefore, I was in favor of saying that at some time in the future, a time not fixed, but when local conditions were such as to justify it, we would grant the Filipinos independence and allow them to go their way. I followed that expression of opinion with this:

Thus, according to this great jurist, our permanent retention of the Philippine Islands would mean our adoption of the British colonial system. And yet we are a Republic, and one of the cardinal tenets of our political faith is that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I entertained these views before I went to that dinner, and they were in nowise affected by it. Fortunately I am so constituted that the mere gratification of appetite does not change my convictions nor in the slightest degree influence my thought. In this respect I differ from some people of my acquaintance whose intellects and consciences are located in their stomachs. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Chairman, among the other persons present on that occasion was the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], who has just spoken.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Oh, that is true. I was there.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. He was there, and I observed particularly the ardor with which he partook of the edibles. [Laughter.]

Politics was not discussed that night at all, nor was the subject of Philippine independence even so much as mentioned. The time was passed in listening to speeches by Gov. Gilbert and Mr. Martin, the guest of honor, and by other gentlemen at the table, but not by myself nor by the gentleman from Minnesota. I did not think that anything like bribery was being attempted, nor when it was all over did I consider that I myself had been corrupted. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MAYS], a member of the committee.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman, if it would not be out of order, I should like to hear a few words about the subject of this debate. This, I understand, is supposed to be a debate upon the leasing bill, but I think we have heard about every other subject discussed that has ever been discussed before this House except the leasing bill under consideration. I remember reading where Artemus Ward made a speech before an English audience, and he said that he had once seen a joke in Punch, and he did not think it was at all out of place that there should be found a joke in a comic paper. So in a debate upon a certain subject some reference should be made to the subject. Now, in this regard, we ought to have a little time to devote to this important measure. I had not intended making any remarks upon this proposition. The Members of the committee and the House understand it so much better than a new Member could possibly expect to understand it; but this series of bills that have been presented here and have been pressed before this House are of such far-reaching importance to the sparsely settled portions of the country from which some of us come that I risk a few comments upon the same.

Mr. Chairman, in this debate, referring back to the debate upon the bill, a great deal has been said to the effect that no rights are expected to be taken away from the States by this legislation, but I wish the gentleman to understand this one proposition, that throughout this debate, having listened intently to what has been said both in the committee and in the House, this point has been made, by those opposing these measures, that the rights of the States involved are taken away from them. That point has not been replied to so far in this debate.

It is admitted by the gentlemen making these speeches, it is admitted in the bill itself, that the waters of the State in the bill that we passed on last Saturday belong to the State. Nobody has replied to that, and when you undertake to grant a right by the Federal Government to use the waters of a State in order that the use of land belonging to the Government may be occupied, you are taking something away from the State in that particular. I wish the gentlemen would reply to that point. They do not dare to argue that question as to whether or not the waters of a State belong to the State, and it must be admitted that it is the flow of the water against the turbine wheels that generates the electricity or develops the power which the gentlemen here intend to sell for so much a horsepower year.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] in his speech said that if he owned a farm adjoining the farm of his neighbor, and the neighbor desired to use his farm, he could dictate the terms on which that neighbor used that farm. But suppose he owned a farm, entirely surrounding his neighbor's property, of

value, could he charge so much for the right of way across that farm that it would confiscate his neighbor's property? Justice has demanded relief from such attempted acts of piracy as that, and the Government can not afford to do that which it would be quick to condemn in an individual.

Now, I do not state here that the Government should sell those power sites, for instance, for \$20 an acre or for any other particular sum. But for the water belonging to the State the State should get its fair proportion of the money that is derived from these leases and from these sales. Any two people owning properties of that sort would get together and make an agreement to that effect; and I think there should be an understanding before this bill finally becomes a law that the States involved, in which these power sites are located, the States owning this water, should receive their proper compensation directly and not after a period of some 20 or 30 years.

Now, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], the other day, commented quite at length upon State rights, but it is clear to any innocent bystander who observes the trend of his oratory that the particular kind of State rights he subscribed to were those that involved his own State. If the rights of his State would be usurped, he would not be adverse to the doctrine of State rights; but if it was a State that was weak in this body, and its rights were usurped, he would not be so particular to assert his doctrine of State rights.

If the Federal Government were reaching out its all-powerful arm to seize the waters of his State under such subterfuge and to withhold for all time the natural resources of his State, thus preventing them from contributing their proper share toward the expenses of government, the establishment of schools, the construction and maintenance of public roads, he would be quick to invoke the time-honored doctrine of States rights in all its ancient and honorable vigor.

I observe in looking at the Record that the gentleman's State has some things that the State of Utah does not have. And the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has also joined in the veiled threat that unless the State of Utah, for instance, appointed a utilities commission it would not get its proper share at any time of these proceeds, and would not have anything to do with the control of these receipts and the control of these properties. I remember being in Chicago not long ago and observing a great exodus from the hotels there to some town in Wisconsin. I asked what was the cause of this exodus, and they said that a great prize fight was to be pulled off in the State of Wisconsin and the people were going up there to see it. We would not allow a prize fight to take place in the State of Utah. When they wanted the Jeffries-Johnson prize fight, and offered quite a number of thousands of dollars to that State, we would not allow it to take place. What would the gentleman from Wisconsin say to our getting up and recommending that the Federal Government appoint a commission to control such things as that in the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. Chairman, I favor utility commissions, but I object to the State of Wisconsin or the State of Oklahoma or any other State dictating to the people of Utah on the subject of utility commissions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this particular bill that is before us today is worthy of some attention on the part of this House. The chairman of this committee has told us that 450,000,000,000 tons of coal have already been exploited upon the public domain—450,000,000,000 tons—and there are a great many other acres to be measured. Perhaps there will be some several hundred other billions of tons of coal. And, yet, in the committee hearings upon this question I have not seen the record that a single operator, that a single man interested in the production of coal, has ever been called before the committee. And the time of this House is occupied in the discussion of every other question when you are disposing of 450,000,000,000 tons of coal as if it were mere pocket change.

Did any prospective investor appear before the committee? Was any governor of any State, so vitally affected, invited to appear? Did any banker say he would invest money upon such a leasehold interest, encumbered and jeopardized by such restrictions, and controlled by a bureau 2,000 miles away?

There were books upon the hearings and the water-power bill, like these books upon the grazing bill of similar size, but what operator has ever appeared before the committee here or before the House to discuss the question of these 450,000,000,000 tons of coal? We are using to-day about 450,000,000 tons of coal per year, not quite 500,000,000. A little less in 1915 than in 1914. Other resources are being rapidly developed to take the place of coal.

At the present rate of consumption, according to the gentleman's statement, there are enough tons of coal already measured

on the public lands, to say nothing of those owned in private, to last this country 900 years if that coal were mined and used as nature most emphatically intended it to be used. Scientists tell us that at the end of 900 years coal will probably be more or less of a natural curiosity outside of the ground. It will be seen, perhaps, in the museums as a natural curiosity, and other things will take its place, such as electricity, and the like, and we should use this coal in this generation and in future generations as it is needed.

Now, I am opposed to this bill, because I believe it is an injustice to the States that we represent; that it does not do the fair thing in the distribution of whatever proceeds there will be arising from it.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] said that no right of taxation was taken away from the States, because the improvements could be taxed. The gentleman must admit the States involved very sorely need the taxes. He enjoys better schools to which to send his children, better roads over which to travel for half the burden. In the State of Wisconsin the improvements on land can be taxed, and the land also, but there is a question even as to whether or not the improvements in this case can be taxed. The chief counsel of the Reclamation Service has recently rendered an opinion to the effect that the improvements in such cases can not be taxed. Whether we agree with the chief counsel or not is not the question at this time, but the land of course can never be taxed withheld as this bill will withhold it. But whether or not we agree with the Reclamation Service, it is the most important question whether or not there will ever be any improvements under this bill to be taxed.

I do not believe that any Member of this House would invest his money on an indeterminate lease, subject to the whim of any Federal official, and put in the money necessary to equip a coal mine. Having had some experience in the last 10 years in trying to induce capital to come out into our country and invest money in coal properties of that State, I believe this bill will not be workable, because the lease is for an indeterminate period and under bureaucratic control. The bill has other provisions in it that would discourage capital from investing money. For instance, it allows all municipalities and domestic users to have the coal without charge.

Now, I am in favor of allowing all municipalities to have coal without charge. That is all right. I believe it is more important that municipalities and communities get coal without charge, if possible, than that this bill should work. But who would invest his money if everybody can have coal without charge? And who would try to build up those great industries out there? If we want to make this bill workable, we should give some kind of a term here, such as we have put in the water-power bill, and make it something more definite.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Utah yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MAYS. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman objects, as I understand, to the Federal Government deriving revenue from these leases?

Mr. MAYS. Oh, no. In speaking of the water-power bill I made the point that while the Federal Government owned the land—and we in the West never disputed that—we make the point, and it is admitted in the bill, that the State owns the water.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAYS. My point is that it is all right for the two owners to get together and divide the proceeds on an equitable basis, the same as this gentleman and another gentleman would do who owns such property.

Mr. BORLAND. That, of course, would reduce the amount of revenue that the Federal Government would get out of the water-power bill and give part of it to the State.

Mr. MAYS. It would not necessarily reduce it. I want to say this—and the gentleman ought to know it—that when you are legislating for 17 great States of this Union you want the sympathy of the people of those States, and if you did the fair and proper thing by those people you would perhaps have their cooperation to such an extent that 50 per cent of the proceeds, under proper terms, would amount to more than 100 per cent under the present terms.

Mr. BORLAND. I want the gentleman to understand me. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the development of the West; in fact, I am a western man. But the gentleman's State has asked, or is going to ask, as I understand, for additional reclamation projects in Utah, and I would like to inquire where the gentleman expects the Federal Government is going to get the money to conduct reclamation projects if no revenue is to be

derived from the public lands or from the incidental use of the public lands?

Mr. MAYS. I have not made any statement to the effect that no revenue should be derived. I have stated that there are 450,000,000,000 tons of coal that you undertake to sell at a minimum of 2 cents a ton. If you sell those 450,000,000,000 tons of coal at 2 cents a ton, you will receive the colossal figure of \$9,000,000,000. Where will you spend it, I will ask the gentleman?

Mr. BORLAND. Of course from the gentleman's own statement it will not all be received at once.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. MAYS] objects to the indeterminate term provided for in the bill. Is not the gentleman aware that an indeterminate lease is a perpetual lease, and runs and is valid so long as the conditions are preserved, and that every operator and utility prefers an indeterminate lease rather than a fixed term?

Mr. MAYS. Where do you find any operator who appeared and said that?

Mr. LENROOT. I did not say that any did appear, but I supposed the gentleman knew it.

Mr. MAYS. Is the gentleman an operator?

Mr. LENROOT. An indeterminate lease runs on forever.

Mr. MAYS. I ask the gentleman if he is an operator?

Mr. LENROOT. No; I am not an operator, but I know the legal definition of the term "indeterminate."

Mr. MAYS. Let me read:

Leases shall be made for indeterminate periods, on condition of diligent development and continuous operation of the mines—

And a great many more conditions, including one relative to eight hours a day for labor, particular conditions to which I would subscribe. But the bill provides that the execution of all these conditions shall be under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has again expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I have an understanding with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] to yield me 30 minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman now 30 minutes, so that he will not be interrupted.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, the speech I have prepared is of such length that I may not be able to finish it in one hour. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may extend it in the RECORD if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCGILLICUDDY). The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAYS. I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT MAPS OF ARCTIC REGIONS CORRECTED.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, my subject is one in which all civilized nations of the world are interested, namely, exploration, discovery, the study of the physical features of the globe upon which we live, and the accurate presentation of the results of such explorations, discoveries, and study on our Government maps and charts.

Scientists, historians, geographers, and educators assure me that they are deeply interested in a movement which will result in official national action on this subject of accurate Government maps, charts, and historical and geographic statistics. This is a matter of vital interest, especially to our educators, who represent the millions of children in our schools, as our Government maps and charts are quoted as the highest authority by map makers; it is of interest to historians, for the reason that their records should present truths and not fables. It is a matter of concern to the navigators of the world, not only those who hold the precious lives of travelers in their charge, but those who sail the seas in the interests of commerce, as one

and all are dependent on the accuracy of the maps and charts supplied them.

Our Government should therefore use every resource at its command and every means in its power to make our own official maps and charts as accurate as is humanly possible.

With this end in view, I shall discuss briefly a few of the discoveries and reported discoveries north of the Arctic Circle.

Mr. Chairman, in the last session of Congress I introduced a resolution in this House asking for the correction of our Government maps and charts of the Arctic regions. That resolution read as follows:

Whereas the maps of the Arctic regions issued by the United States Navy Department erroneously show waterways that do not exist and lands that are really deep sea, while lands that do exist are omitted altogether; and

Whereas such false chartings on the United States maps, especially those numbered 2142 and 2560 issued by the Hydrographic Office, are a menace to navigation and exploration, and should not be distributed; and

Whereas the taxpayers of this country should not be compelled to pay for maps with erroneous chartings; and

Whereas these maps issued by the Navy Department are the authority on which the geography of the Arctic regions is taught in our schools, as they bear the official stamp of the Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy report to Congress the reason why the distribution of these erroneous maps is not discontinued and why corrected maps of the Arctic regions are not issued by the Navy Department.

This resolution was introduced by me on February 25, 1915. As the Congress adjourned on March 4, 1915, the remainder of the last session was too short to permit of action on a matter of such far-reaching import as that embodied in the resolution. I therefore took the subject in hand with the interested departments of our Government, namely, the Navy Department and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with the result that I am informed by the Secretary of the Navy, the Hon. Josephus Daniels, in correspondence which I shall quote later, that Hydrographic Office (Navy Department) chart No. 2142 has been officially canceled and withdrawn from issue, and that Hydrographic Office (Navy Department) chart No. 2560 is in the hands of the engravers for necessary corrections.

To illustrate the importance of this action by the Navy Department and to demonstrate the fact that this cancellation and these corrections are not matters of small moment, but practically revolutionize the history of modern exploration and discovery, as depicted on our maps and charts, I shall explain more fully the two charts mentioned in my resolution of February 25, 1915:

Chart No. 2142 bears the title, "North America Polar Regions, Baffin Bay to Lincoln Sea, showing the recent discoveries by Civil Engineer R. E. Peary, United States Navy," and so forth.

A prominent feature of this chart is a broad channel extending from Nordenskiöld Inlet on the northwest coast of Greenland to a point called Independence Bay, depicted on this chart as opening into a body of water called East Greenland Sea, at about 32° west longitude. This channel is represented on the chart as separating the northern portion of Greenland from the mainland, and is shown on the chart as Peary Channel.

This Peary Channel and East Greenland Sea are among the earliest of Mr. Peary's claimed discoveries; and are rated among the most important of modern explorations, as by the discovery of the "channel" Peary claimed to have established the insularity of Greenland.

The alleged discovery of this channel was made by Peary on his Arctic expedition of 1891-92. With one companion, Elvind Astrup (since deceased), Peary traveled eastward across the Greenland ice cap to the point he called "Navy Cliff." In his book, "Northward Over the Great Ice," pages 334, 335, 336, Peary says:

Our observation point was a giant cliff, almost vertical, overlooking the bay, and a great glacier that entered the bay on our right. Some 15 miles northeast of where we stood the cliffs ended in a bold cape, which I named Glacier Cape. Dark clouds seen over and beyond the ice cap seemed to indicate that the shore line trended rapidly away to the east or southeast. Looking to the west we saw the opening of the fiord that had barred our northern advance. It was this fiord whose western entrance we had descried afar off days before. Now we knew that we had paralleled its course across the northern end of the mainland from Robeson Channel clear to the Arctic Ocean off the shores of northeast Greenland. * * * It was evident that this channel (Peary Channel) marked the northern boundary of the mainland of Greenland.

As Peary stated that this channel "marked the northern boundary of the mainland of Greenland," it was supposed to prove the insularity of Greenland, although this question had been practically decided 10 years earlier by Lockwood and Brainard of the Lady Franklin Bay expedition under Gen. Greely in their explorations of the true northern coast of Greenland.

For 20 years Mr. Peary posed as the discoverer of the Peary Channel, the discoverer of the East Greenland Sea, and the discoverer of the insularity of Greenland.

But in 1906-1908 an expedition was organized and equipped by the Danish Government to explore the unknown portion of the east coast of Greenland. This expedition was led by L. Mylius-Erichsen, a successful and daring explorer, who in 1902-1904 led the Danish Literary Greenland Expedition. Erichsen planned to explore the east coast of Greenland as far north as Independence Bay and then follow Peary Channel through to the west coast. While the main scientific objects of the expedition were attained, Mylius-Erichsen, First Lieutenant Niels Peter Hoeg-Hagen, and Jorgen Brönlund lost their lives on the northern sledge trip. The body of Brönlund was found by other members of the expedition before their return to Denmark, and Brönlund's diary told of the death of his companions several days earlier, but although careful search was made no trace of the bodies of Mylius-Erichsen and Hoeg-Hagen was found at that time. In 1909, however, an expedition was sent out by the Danish Government to search for the bodies of Mylius-Erichsen and Hoeg-Hagen, as well as their diaries, observation books, and other records. This expedition was led by Capt. Ejnar Mikkelsen, who returned to Denmark in 1912 with the records of the ill-fated party. A summary of Mikkelsen's report is embodied in volume 41 of *Meddelelser Om Grønland*, 1913, which also contains the Report on the Denmark Expedition to the Northeast Coast of Greenland, 1906-1908, under Mylius-Erichsen. I quote from pages 472-474:

The second report (of Mylius-Erichsen) was found on the summer camp and read as follows:

"We drove westward with 23 dogs until the 1st of June, and reached Peary's Cape Glacier; discovered that the Peary Channel *does not exist*; Navy Cliff is connected by fast land with Heilprin Land. We renamed Independence Bay Independence Fjord and built a cairn (with report) on a low point near Cape Glacier.

"(Signed) MYLIUS-ERICHSEN.

"AUGUST 8, 1907."

It will be seen from the foregoing that the honor of discovering that the Peary Channel does not exist belongs to Mylius-Erichsen, and that the honor of making the discovery known to the world falls to Ejnar Mikkelsen.

The nonexistence of Peary Channel was not all that was learned of Peary's explorations by the Denmark expedition. On page 214 of the above-mentioned volume we read:

To understand why Mylius-Erichsen first took Danmarks Fjord and then Hagens Fjord to be Independence Bay, it must be remembered that on all his charts from these regions around here Peary states that from Academy Glacier the coast bends almost in the direction southeast, whereas according to what has been found out by the Danish expedition, it turns on the contrary almost in the direction northeast. This mistake on Peary's part thus became of extremely fateful importance to Mylius-Erichsen and his companions. For it was owing to this long journey into Danmarks Fjord and Hagens Fjord that their retreat was begun too late and had to be given up on account of the comparatively sudden melting of the snow. And we know that their enforced summer in the north led to their death.

As stated in the above-quoted paragraph, chart No. 2142, based on Peary's reports, shows the coast of Greenland bending away sharply to the southeast. To my mind, the fact that three explorers had lost their lives owing to the incorrectness of this chart, was more than sufficient reason for its cancellation.

But, some one may object, we have only the uncorroborated word of these men against Mr. Peary's, that the Peary Channel does not exist, and that the charting of the east coast of Greenland was not correctly given by him. Let me quote from the International Yearbook for 1913, published by Dodd, Mead & Co., of New York:

An important advance in the exploration of the vast interior of Greenland had been made by three traverses of the inland ice sheet. Knud Rasmussen, with the Dane, Freuchen, and two Eskimos of Smith Sound, started on April 6, 1912, across the inland ice from Ingfield Gulf, West Greenland, to Danmark Fjord and Independence Bay on the east coast. * * * Just to the north of Peary's Navy Cliff, the party looked in vain for the Peary Channel, which was supposed to form the northern boundary of Greenland. Instead of the channel they found an ice-free upland, abounding in game.

The nonexistence of Peary Channel from sea to sea has been proven, for the ill-fated Mylius-Erichsen discovered this fact, which was later verified by Rasmussen.

The indisputable proof of the nonexistence of the Peary Channel automatically deprives Mr. Peary of the honor of two other of his claimed discoveries, namely, the insularity of Greenland and the East Greenland Sea. As Greenland is not bounded on the north by Peary Channel, the claimed discovery of a channel which does not exist could not prove the insularity of Greenland, which had already been satisfactorily determined by the explorations of the members of the Greely expedition in 1882.

The discovery of the East Greenland Sea by Mr. Peary was another claimed result of his 1891-92 expedition. The area extending from about 82° 10' north latitude and 31° west longitude to about 12° west longitude was mapped by Mr. Peary as

the East Greenland Sea. This area was discovered by Lieut. J. P. Koch, of the Mylius-Erichsen expedition, to be dry land. Koch's discovery was confirmed by the later expeditions of Mikelsen and Rasmussen, and the territory named by Mr. Peary "East Greenland Sea" is shown on the latest map published by the National Geographic Society as "Amdrup Land," "Erichsen Land," and so forth.

Another of the Peary "discoveries" shown on Hydrographic Office chart No. 2142 is "Jesup Land." This is the large island southwest of Grant Land and separated from it by Nansen Sound, and from Raanes Peninsula and Fosheim Peninsula by Eureka Sound. This land was discovered by Capt. Otto Sverdrup in 1900 and was mapped and explored by members of his expedition. The island was named by Sverdrup "Axel Heiberg Land" and the extreme northern portion of the island was christened "Svartevæg" by him.

Capt. Sverdrup returned to Norway in September, 1902, and his official report of that year places "Axel Heiberg Land" on the maps of the world to Norway's credit, while its coast lines, sounds, fjords, mountains, and other topographical and geographical features were mapped by him with thoroughness and accuracy. Hydrographic Office chart No. 2142, published by our Navy Department in 1903, the year after Sverdrup's report was made, shows a vague mass, without distinct outline or detail of any kind, across which is printed "Jesup Land." This vague outline on chart No. 2142 is the only hint Peary gives of his alleged discovery of this land until 1907, when his book, *Nearest the Pole*, was published. On page 202 of that book he says:

From the summit 2,000 feet above the sea level (on Grant Land) and of a more truly Alpine character than any that I have seen in northern Greenland, or Grant Land, the view was more than interesting. * * * East lay the wide white zone of the ice foot; west the unbroken surface of Nansen's Strait, and beyond it the northern part of that western land which I saw from the heights of the Ellesmere Land ice cap. In July, 1898, and named "Jesup Land," although Sverdrup has later given it the name of "Heiberg Land."

Note carefully the date on which Mr. Peary claims to have first seen "Jesup Land"—July, 1898—"from the heights of Ellesmere Land." Note carefully, also, the following quotation from Peary's report to President Jesup and members of the Peary Arctic Club on his work done in the Arctic in 1898-1902. I quote from his report, as printed in his book, *Nearest the Pole*, pages 296 and 297:

In the spring of 1898 the Peary Arctic Club was organized. Morris K. Jesup, Henry W. Cannon, H. L. Bridgman, all personal friends of mine, forming the nucleus about which the rest of you assembled, and in May the *Windward* (loaned by Alfred Harmsworth, of London) arrived; but to my regret and disappointment, the machinists' strike in England having prevented the installation of new engines, she was practically nothing but a sailing craft.

The lateness of the season was such that I had to make the most of the *Windward* as she was. But her extreme slowness (3½ knots under favorable circumstances) and the introduction of a disturbing factor in the appropriation by another of my plan and field of work necessitated the charter of an auxiliary ship if I did not wish to be distanced. The *Windward* sailed from New York on the 4th of July, 1898, and on the 7th I went on board the *Hope* at Sydney, Cape Briton.

Pushing rapidly northward and omitting the usual calls at the Danish Greenland ports, Cape York was reached after a voyage uneventful except for a nip in the ice of Melville Bay.

The work of hunting walrus and assembling my party of natives commenced at once; the *Windward* soon joined us, after which the hunting was prosecuted by both ships until the final rendezvous at Etah, whence both ships steamed out on Saturday, August 13, the *Windward* to continue northward, the *Hope* bound for home.

From Peary's own statements, therefore, we must conclude that he has solved the hitherto unsolvable problem of how to occupy two widely separated points at one and the same time, since, according to his own report, he was occupied from the time of his departure from New York on July 4, 1898, until August 13, 1898, with his journey to Cape York and his arduous work of hunting walrus and assembling his party of natives, while through some highly developed psychological and physiological ability he was, according to his own report, in July, 1898, viewing from the heights of the Ellesmere Land ice cap—nearly 300 miles distant—that western land which he claims to have seen and named "Jesup Land."

It is also a geographic fact that this same western land is so situated that even were Mr. Peary gifted with supernatural vision he could not possibly have seen it at the place where he located it, since it is not there, but much farther south and a great deal farther west. On Hydrographic Office chart No. 2142 "Jesup Land" is shown directly north of Arthur Land, while in reality this land which Capt. Sverdrup named "Axel Heiberg Land" is not north of Arthur Land but far to the west of it. The National Geographic Society on its latest maps has removed Mr. Peary's "Jesup Land," and gives Capt. Sverdrup credit for the discovery and naming of the land which Mr. Peary called "Jesup Land." Therefore, by reason of Capt. Sverdrup's priority of discovery and correct charting of Axel Heiberg Land,

Peary can not claim the honor of the discovery of the land shown as "Jesup Land" on Hydrographic Office chart No. 2142.

Let us now examine Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560, mentioned in my resolution of February 25, 1915, as one of the charts requiring cancellation or correction. On this chart, corrected to January 22, 1915, we find "Jesup Land" changed to "Axel Heiberg Land" and moved to its proper position. We also find the "East Greenland Sea" occupied by "Amdrup Land" and "Erichsen Land," while the northeastern boundary of Greenland has been moved eastward some 20 degrees of longitude, but the fictitious "Peary Channel" is still shown on chart No. 2560 as the northern boundary of the mainland of Greenland.

On this same chart, northwest of Grant Land, in latitude about 82° N. and longitude about 102° W., is an undefined body of land marked "Crocker Land," which Robert E. Peary claimed that he discovered in 1906.

Peary's first mention of "Crocker Land" is found on page 202 of his book *Nearest the Pole*, when, quoting from his diary of June 24, 1906, he says:

From the summit, 2,000 feet above the sea level, the view was more than interesting. * * * North stretched the well-known ragged surface of the polar pack, and northwest it was with a thrill that my glasses revealed the faint white summits of a distant land, which my Eskimos claimed to have seen as we came along from the last camp.

Four days later, after four days of travel westward, Peary writes in his diary, while at his camp at the northernmost point of Axel Heiberg Land (p. 207 of *Nearest the Pole*):

The clear day greatly favored my work in taking a round of angles, and with the glasses I could make out apparently a little more distinctly the snow-clad summits of the distant land in the northwest above the ice horizon.

My heart leaped the intervening miles of ice as I looked longingly at this land, and in fancy I trod its shores and climbed its summits, even though I knew that that pleasure could only be for another in another season.

But that pleasure was neither for Peary nor for "another in another season"! In 1913 the "Crocker land expedition" was sent out by the American Museum of Natural History, in New York, and the American Geographical Society, under the leadership of Donald B. McMillan (a member of the last Peary expedition), to explore and chart Crocker Land. In November, 1914, advices were received from McMillan by the museum stating that Crocker Land does not exist. McMillan's own story is published in Harper's Monthly Magazine for October and November, 1915. I quote from the November number, pages 925-26:

On the morning of the 22d (of April, 1914) Green got a latitude of 81° 52' and a longitude of 103° 32'. To increase our latitude we set a more northerly course on the 23d and 24th, with a variation of 175 degrees westerly. Observations on these two days put us in latitude 82° 30', longitude 108° 22'. We had not only reached the brown spot on the map (Crocker Land), but were 30 miles inland! You can imagine how earnestly we scanned every foot of that horizon—not a thing in sight. We were convinced that we were in pursuit of a will-o'-the-wisp. * * * Our dreams of the last four years were merely dreams; our hopes had ended in bitter disappointment.

In June, 1906, Peary stood on the summit of a peak 2,000 feet high on the northern coast of Grant Land and made his claimed discovery of this land, which he named Crocker Land. But the location of this land had already been conveniently fixed for Mr. Peary. It had long been a favorite theory of some scientists that land might exist in that portion of the polar sea. The report of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for 1904 contains a chart on which this hypothetical land is located at about 82° north latitude and about 100° west longitude. This chart appeared in 1904, while Mr. Peary did not start on the trip on which he "discovered" this land until one year later, in 1905. Thus this land, which was shown by the Coast and Geodetic Survey as a possibility, was accepted by Peary as an actuality and discovered as such, while Prof. McMillan now proves it to have been only an imaginary dream.

Another feature of Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560 deserving careful consideration is the presentation of a line of deep-sea soundings extending along the line of the seventieth meridian west of Greenwich from 83° 7' north latitude to 89° 55' north latitude. These soundings Peary claims to have made on his last Arctic expedition.

As this is the only line of soundings ever claimed to have been made in an approximately straight line to a latitude as far north as 89° 55', the results are of peculiar interest. Let us consider the conditions under which the soundings were made.

It is a well-known fact, proven by Arctic explorers from the time of John Davis in 1585 up to the present time, that three sets of observations are necessary in the Arctic regions to establish a navigator's or traveler's position, namely, observations for latitude, observations for longitude, and observations for compass or magnetic variation, for there, as elsewhere, the compass needle points neither to the geographic North Pole

nor to the magnetic North Pole, but varies its direction to a greater or less degree with every change of the traveler's position. Therefore frequent and careful observations are absolutely necessary in order to determine one's position.

Another well-known fact, proven by many Arctic explorers and disputed by none, is that the ice of the polar sea is not stationary, but is continually in motion, the average drift being not less than 3 miles per day, and often more, according to the force of the wind and the influence of various other conditions. This is another reason why frequent and accurate observations for latitude, for longitude, and for compass variations are absolutely necessary to determine an explorer's position as soon as he leaves the land.

At a hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives in 1911 Mr. Peary testified that at no time on the Arctic expedition on which these soundings were made did he or any member of his party attempt to make any observations for longitude; at no time during the expedition on which this line of soundings was made did Mr. Peary or any member of his party make any observations for compass variation; nor did Peary have with him on that expedition any chart showing variations already determined by other explorers in the Arctic regions. Mr. Peary also stated to the congressional committee that throughout a journey of 410 miles over the trackless expanse of the Arctic Ocean he made only three observations for latitude, and these were made while the sun was at no time higher than 7° above the horizon, while an altitude of 10° above the horizon is the lowest altitude at which our Navy Department declares approximately accurate observations for latitude can be made. The three observations made by Mr. Peary for latitude were, of course, valueless without the correlative observations for longitude and for compass variation. The fact is indisputable, therefore, that at no time after he left the sight of land could Mr. Peary have known his position, since he claims to have traveled by compass, yet did not know the direction in which his compass needle pointed, neither did he know whether he was traveling on the 70th or any other meridian, or at right angles to both.

In marked contrast with Peary's lack of observations on his so-called polar trip is Dr. Nansen's report of his Arctic expedition across the Polar Sea in the *Fram*, and Nansen's sledge expedition toward the pole. Dr. Nansen's scientific observations on this polar expedition fill six large volumes and comprise data of the greatest scientific interest and value. On his sledge trip toward the pole he averaged five daily observations for latitude, longitude, and compass variation, while in 37 days Peary made three observations for latitude only.

The observations of the astronomer on board the *Fram*, in relation to the variation of the magnetic needle, show the utter impossibility of traveling in a straight line by compass only. I quote from volume 2, pages 33, 34, and 35, "Scientific Results of the Norwegian North Polar Expedition, 1893-1896, by Fridtjof Nansen":

June 12, 1894. The needle in motion eastward. The needle more disturbed in the afternoon than in the morning. The needle much disturbed—danced up and down.

June 13, 1894 (4 miles farther north). The needle oscillated rapidly backward and forward. The needle returning from a westerly movement. Eastward motion—

And so forth.

Pursuant to my resolution of February 25, 1915, I wrote the Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Josephus Daniels, a letter under date of October 5, 1915, as follows:

OCTOBER 5, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. DANIELS: Will you kindly inform me upon just what data the sounding of 1,500 fathoms, 5 miles from the North Pole, was placed on Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560, covering the Arctic regions? Also please state who furnished the data.

Under date of October 19, 1915, Secretary Daniels replied to my letter in the following communication:

OCTOBER 19, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. HELGESEN: In reply to your letter of the 5th instant, No. 216, requesting to be informed "upon just what data the sounding of 1,500 fathoms 5 miles from the North Pole was placed on Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560, covering the Arctic regions," and also "who furnished the data," I have to state that the soundings shown on chart No. 2560 along the general line of the meridian between Cape Columbia and the North Pole, one of which is the 1,500-fathom sounding referred to by you, were obtained from data supplied the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey by Civil Engineer R. E. Peary, United States Navy, and that said soundings were afterwards furnished the Hydrographic Office by the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I note that the gentleman attacks the claimed discovery of the North Pole by Commander Peary. Does he give countenance to the alleged discovery of the same place by a rival explorer?

Mr. HELGESEN. In these remarks I am dealing wholly with the correction of our maps in so far as the Government has put anything upon them that an American discoverer claims to have discovered, and there is no other discoverer that I know of who has got anything on our maps that does not deserve to be there. I will come to that a little later.

Mr. SLOAN. I notice the gentleman speaks of this in relation to his resolution of February 25, 1915.

Mr. HELGESEN. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Has the gentleman reintroduced that resolution in this Congress?

Mr. HELGESEN. I have not, because—

Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman intend to press this to a hearing, so that the whole matter of the North Pole discovery may be opened up by congressional investigation?

Mr. HELGESEN. I do not, because this has already been settled officially by the Government. So far as Peary is concerned, he is officially off our Government maps to-day. For that reason I do not intend to press for any hearing on something that is already settled.

As this letter from the Secretary of the Navy showed that the data for the soundings on chart No. 2560 was furnished by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, I then communicated with Dr. E. Lester Jones, Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, in a letter dated November 26, 1915, in which I said:

NOVEMBER 26, 1915.

MY DEAR DR. JONES: On Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560, a sounding of 1,500 fathoms is indicated at a distance of 5 miles from the North Pole (89° 55').

The Hon. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy, has informed me, under date of October 19, 1915, that the Coast and Geodetic Survey furnished the Hydrographic Office with the data which placed this sounding of 1,500 fathoms at 5 miles from the North Pole upon Hydrographic Office Chart No. 2560.

Will you please inform me who furnished the Coast and Geodetic Survey with the data, and the exact nature of that data which resulted in placing a 1,500-fathom sounding as above stated, and which is shown on page 56 of the report of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, 1910?

Kindly furnish me with copy of report giving said data and the method or system employed to check the data; also state by what department of the Coast and Geodetic Survey said checking was done.

Sincerely, yours,

H. T. HELGESEN.

On December 1, 1915, I received a letter from the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which reads:

DECEMBER 1, 1915.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter of the 26th instant, I inclose herewith photo copies of two letters referring to the profile of soundings taken by the Peary expedition, and a photo copy of the profile which was furnished the Hydrographic Office October 30, 1909.

It is assumed that this profile is the data mentioned by the Hon. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy, as having been furnished by this bureau to the Hydrographic Office for indicating depths in the vicinity of the North Pole on Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560. The letters recite the circumstances under which these data were furnished.

Yours, respectfully,

R. L. FARIS,
Acting Superintendent.

As this letter did not mention the manner in which the data furnished the Coast and Geodetic Survey by the Peary expedition were checked, I again wrote Dr. Jones, under date of December 2, 1915, as follows:

DECEMBER 2, 1915.

MY DEAR DR. JONES: A letter from your office signed by R. L. Faris, Acting Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with inclosures, just received, in reply to my letter of November 26.

Mr. Faris's letter does not contain quite all of the information which I desire. Permit me to call your attention to the last paragraph of my letter, which remains unanswered. I will therefore ask you to reply specifically to the following:

Just what method or system was employed to check the data of which you have sent me photostat copies. Also, please state what department of the Coast and Geodetic Survey checked these data.

As I am particularly interested in the sounding of 1,500 fathoms, located on the "Profile of Soundings" at 89° 55' north latitude, I wish you would inform me if any attempt was made to verify the point at which that sounding was made, and if so, what verification of said position is in the possession of your department?

Sincerely, yours,

H. T. HELGESEN.

Acting Superintendent R. L. Faris promptly and courteously replied to the above letter on December 4, 1915:

DECEMBER 4, 1915.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter of the 2d instant, I have to state that in so far as can be learned from the files of this office, the letters, photograph copies of which were forwarded you, and a photograph copy of the profile of soundings taken by the Peary Expedition included all the data furnished the Hydrographic Office October 30, 1909, for indicating depths in the vicinity of the North Pole on Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560.

Under the circumstances the depths of the soundings are not susceptible to a check like those obtained in a detailed hydrographic survey. At the time the profile of soundings was furnished the Hydrographic Office there is no record of this bureau having data available for checking the geographical position of the soundings.

I trust the above will meet your requirements and shall be glad if you will call upon us whenever we can be of any assistance to you.
Yours, respectfully,

R. L. FARIS,
Acting Superintendent.

This letter of Mr. Faris's left me somewhat in doubt as to whether or not any data had been furnished the Coast and Geodetic Survey at any time since October 30, 1909, which would throw further light on these soundings. I therefore wrote Dr. Jones again on December 7, 1915, a letter, which I quote:

DECEMBER 7, 1915.

DEAR DR. JONES: A reply to my letter of December 2 is just received, signed by Acting Superintendent R. L. Faris. This letter states that you have already sent me "all the data furnished the Hydrographic Office October 30, 1909, for indicating depths in the vicinity of the North Pole on Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560."

The letter also states that:
"At the time the profile of soundings was furnished the Hydrographic Office there is no record of this bureau having data available for checking the geographical position of the soundings."

I regret the necessity of troubling you further in the matter, but I desire a little further information; and therefore ask you to kindly inform me if at any time since October 30, 1909, up to the present time, the Coast and Geodetic Survey has been furnished with data or information by any member of the Peary expedition which would enable a checking or verification of the geographical positions of these soundings to be made.

Thanking you for your courtesy and prompt replies to my various inquiries, I am,
Very sincerely, yours,

H. T. HELGESEN.

Superintendent Jones's ultimate reply to my inquiry read as follows:

UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY,
Washington, December 18, 1915.

Hon. HENRY T. HELGESEN.

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of December 10, and subsequent verbal conversation and requests up to the present date, in which you ask if the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey has been furnished with data or information by any member of the Peary expedition which will enable a checking or verification of the geographical positions of the soundings to be made:

This bureau has never at any time received any data from any member of the Peary expedition of 1908-9 which would enable a determination or verification of the geographical position of the soundings referred to in the profile of soundings furnished by Mr. Peary as a result of his 1908-9 expedition, to be made.

The geographical positions of these soundings therefore can not be verified by the survey, and each and every one of them can be accepted only as submitted.

I am, respectfully, yours,

E. LESTER JONES,
Superintendent Coast and Geodetic Survey.

I have therefore, as the result of my investigation into this line of soundings shown on Hydrographic Office chart 2560, the official word of the Secretary of the Navy, in whose department of the Government Mr. Peary was employed at the time of and during his last Arctic expedition, and the official statement of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, under whose department of the Government these soundings were undertaken, that they are not susceptible of checking, and therefore are not susceptible of proof.

But if not susceptible of proof, this profile of soundings furnished the Coast and Geodetic Survey by Mr. Peary as the most valuable scientific result of his last Arctic expedition is certainly susceptible of disproof, and should therefore be removed from our charts and maps. I shall illustrate by a few examples of the soundings as given by Peary; and in this connection I would say that in quoting from Peary's narrative or book of his last Arctic expedition I am making use only of material offered by Peary himself as official evidence of his journey to the North Pole, for at the congressional hearing in 1911 he presented his book as testimony, and at that same hearing Peary stated:

If that is in my book, I will stand by it. (See p. 122 of the hearing.)

We note on Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560 and on the "profile of soundings" furnished the Coast and Geodetic Survey by Peary—a photographic copy of which is in my possession—a sounding of 310 fathoms claimed to have been made by Prof. Marvin at 85° 23' north latitude, and another sounding of 700 fathoms, with no bottom reached, claimed to have been made by Marvin at 85° 33'.

On page 243 of Peary's book relating the story of his last Arctic expedition he says:

The end of this march put us between 85° 7' and 85° 30'. The actual position, as figured later, was 85° 23'.

On page 246 of the same book Peary says:

At the next camp Marvin made a sounding and, to our surprise, reached bottom at only 310 fathoms—

Thus locating his sounding of 310 fathoms one camp beyond 85° 23', although it is shown at 85° 23' on chart No. 2560 and on the profile of soundings. Peary states in the book that the "next camp" beyond 85° 23' was at 85° 33', so that, in order

to be consistent, he should have located the sounding of 310 fathoms at 85° 33' instead of at 85° 23'. But at his claimed latitude of 85° 33' he shows a sounding of 700 fathoms, with no bottom reached, instead of the sounding of 310 fathoms which he says he took at this point. It is plainly evident, therefore, that neither of these soundings was taken at the points indicated on chart No. 2560 and on the "profile of soundings"; and as there is no possible method of determining where they were taken, or if they were taken at all, they should be removed from Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560 and any other of our Government maps and charts whereon they may appear.

The next sounding shown on the chart and on the profile is claimed by Peary to have been made by Robert Bartlett at 87° 15' north latitude, and is so indicated on chart No. 2560 and on the profile of soundings. But neither does this position correspond with other statements made by Peary. On page 262 of Peary's book he says:

Bartlett made a sounding of 1,260 fathoms, but found no bottom.

On the profile of soundings this sounding of 1,260 fathoms is shown at 87° 15'. On page 264 of the book, Peary tells us that the day after Bartlett made the sounding of 1,260 fathoms they traveled "a good 20 miles." The following day he says they again traveled 20 miles (p. 266). This brought them to the point where Bartlett left the expedition and returned to the ship, which point Peary assures us was 87° 46' 49", or a scant 87° 47'. As Bartlett traveled 40 miles after making the 1,260-fathom sounding, and we are told by Peary that he reached 87° 47' north latitude, the place where he took the sounding must have been 40 miles south of 87° 47', or 87° 7', instead of 87° 15' as shown by Peary on the profile of soundings. Therefore, while this discrepancy proves absolutely that Bartlett's sounding of 1,260 fathoms was not made at 87° 15', as indicated by Peary, we have no method to determine where it really was taken, if at all; and I insist that this sounding also should be removed from all of our charts and maps where it may appear.

The profile of soundings and chart No. 2560 also show a sounding which Mr. Peary claims to have personally made at 89° 55' north latitude.

At the hearing before the Naval Committee in 1911 Peary described his most northern camp as located at 89° 57' north latitude. Again, at the same hearing, he located it at 89° 55', and yet again at 89° 52', thus giving three different locations for this camp. (See pp. 31, 40, and 128 of hearing.) In the published hearing a quotation is made from Peary's diary, reading as follows:

Impossible to find place to sound; 5 miles south from camp, 1,500 fathoms, no bottom (p. 40).

On page 304 of Peary's book we find this paragraph:

We crowded on all speed for the first 5 miles of our return journey. Then we came to a narrow crack, which was filled with recent ice, which furnished a chance to try for a sounding. Our sounding apparatus gave us 1,500 fathoms of water, with no bottom.

We have therefore Peary's own statement in his book and his official statement made to the Committee on Naval Affairs in 1911 that this sounding of 1,500 fathoms and no bottom was made at a point some 5 miles distant from his northernmost camp. As he locates his northernmost camp variously at 89° 57', 89° 55', and 89° 52', it is evident that this sounding of 1,500 fathoms was not made at 89° 55'. Where it was really made no one, not even Mr. Peary, is in a position to say.

The soundings claimed to have been made by Peary near the coast of Grant Land are not new to science, since in 1876 Commander Markham made soundings as far north as 83° 20', thus antedating Mr. Peary in this region by 30 years.

This alleged "profile of soundings" is of interest in its bearing on another matter, of which I shall speak briefly. At a hearing before the House Committee on Naval Affairs, on March 4, 1910, Prof. O. H. Tittmann, then Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, made the following official statement:

When Mr. Peary returned from the Arctic he sent us (the Coast and Geodetic Survey) the volumes of the tidal observations that he had made. Mr. Peary also forwarded to us a line of soundings which he had made extending from Cape Columbia to within about 5 miles of the pole. So he forwarded those to me officially, and that is the official record we have of his having been at the North Pole.

Supt. Tittmann was then asked by Congressman Dawson, a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs:

What official evidence is there of the fact you have just stated—that this party, consisting of Peary and the others, reached that point—that is, within striking distance of the pole? Is there any official record?

To which question Supt. Tittmann replied:

I have no official evidence of that except, as I said, the line of soundings under Peary's signature.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, since these fictitious soundings reported by Peary, which do not correspond in any way with other

stories related by him, are the only official evidence presented by Peary that he reached the North Pole, I make the unqualified assertion that Robert E. Peary never did reach the North Pole nor any place approximately near to that geographic point. Mr. Peary thus far has furnished no reasonable evidence that he has reached the North Pole, and as he testified before the Navy Committee that he had produced all the evidence he possessed it is quite evident that he never can establish his claim to its discovery.

At the time of the congressional hearings on Peary's alleged discovery of the North Pole an effort was made to becloud the issue by the introduction as evidence of 21 volumes of so-called scientific data procured by the expedition. These 21 volumes contained the tidal observations referred to by Supt. Tittmann in his testimony, every one of which tidal observations was made at a coastwise point, and the greater number of them before the so-called polar expedition left the ship. Not one of these tidal observations was made, or is claimed to have been made, en route to or returning from or at the place which Peary named the North Pole.

A second attempt was made to becloud the issue by statements made to the congressional committee that the Coast and Geodetic Survey had received two additional volumes of meteorological observations made and signed by Prof. Ross G. Marvin, who accompanied Peary a short distance on his alleged polar journey; but a letter dated July 26, 1915, signed by Dr. E. Lester Jones, Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, shows that these observations were all made in 1908, while Peary's sledge expedition did not leave land until February, 1909. In other words, these meteorological observations were all made prior to Peary's departure from land. I quote Dr. Jones's letter:

JULY 26, 1915.

Hon. HENRY T. HELGESEN.

MY DEAR SIR: Complying with your request in reference to a letter to Mr. Tittmann, former Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, dated June 14, 1910, written by Commander R. E. Peary, advising that he was sending to this bureau two books of additional meteorological observations and chronometer comparisons made by Prof. Marvin, I wish to say that these volumes only refer to observations made during the year 1908 and make no reference whatsoever to the year 1909.

I am, respectfully, yours,

E. LESTER JONES,
Superintendent.

A third attempt was made to becloud the issue when the congressional committee was informed that Prof. Donald B. McMillan had made certain scientific observations which established Mr. Peary's claim to the attainment of the North Pole. I have in my possession the photographic reproduction of a letter written by Prof. McMillan to Mr. Peary, from which I shall quote. Note particularly the date of the letter:

ROOSEVELT, January 9, 1909.

R. E. PEARY, United States Navy.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to submit supplementary report on my tidal observations at Cape Columbia.

Respectfully, yours,

D. B. McMILLAN.

The report accompanying this letter is dated January 4, 1909, showing that the observations contained therein must have been made before Mr. Peary's sledge expedition left the ship in February, 1909.

The assertion is sometimes made that any denial of the authenticity of Mr. Peary's claims is an attempt to pervert history. Mr. Chairman, it is this very perversion of history that I desire to prevent. Is it a perversion of history to deny Peary's claims when they are repudiated and canceled not only by the laymen but by the expert scientists of those two departments, namely, the Navy Department and the Coast and Geodetic Survey? The Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Navy Department (Hydrographic Office) have repudiated and canceled Mr. Peary's "Peary Channel," thereby denying his claim also to the discovery of the insularity of Greenland. The Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Navy Department (Hydrographic Office) have repudiated and canceled Mr. Peary's "East Greenland Sea," where high land has been found to exist. The Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Navy Department (Hydrographic Office) have repudiated and canceled Mr. Peary's claimed discovery of "Crocker Land," which has been found to be only a broad expanse of the Polar Sea. The Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Navy Department (Hydrographic Office) have repudiated Mr. Peary's claimed discovery of "Jesup Land," and on our charts have placed "Axel Heiberg Land" in its stead, which land is shown where it actually exists, and not where the fictitious "Jesup Land" was placed by Mr. Peary.

My resolution requesting the correction of our Government charts and maps of the Arctic region led to careful investigations by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Navy Department, which investigations have resulted in the cancellation of Hydrographic Office chart No. 2142 and the correction of Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560, as witness correspondence be-

tween Secretary of the Navy Daniels and myself, from which I shall quote.

The first letter from the Hydrographic Office read in part, as follows:

MARCH 29, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. HELGESEN: I have received a copy of House joint resolution 431, introduced in the House by you on the 25th ultimo, relative to certain charts issued by this office, with particular reference to Hydrographic Office charts Nos. 2142 and 2560, and I note that you find objections to the same in that they are supposed not to be correct.

If you will kindly inform me what faults you find or objections you have to the two charts above mentioned, and any other charts, I assure you the information will be carefully considered and every weight given it.

Very sincerely,

THOS. WASHINGTON,
Captain, United States Navy, Hydrographer.

I replied to this letter, giving my objections to charts Nos. 2560 and 2142, as I have stated them in this speech, together with other information too voluminous to quote now, and on April 28, 1915, I received a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, which reads:

APRIL 28, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. HELGESEN: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 216 of the 14th instant, addressed to the hydrographer, and certain information relative to Hydrographic Office charts Nos. 2142 and 2560 covering portions of the Arctic regions.

Relative to Hydrographic Office chart No. 2142, I have to state that * * * the chart has been withdrawn from issue and canceled.

The department will be pleased to receive any information you may be able to give it in connection with the contemplated revision of the polar charts.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

After further correspondence relative to Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560, Secretary Daniels wrote me under date of September 17, 1915, a letter from which I quote:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. HELGESEN: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 1st instant.

In further reference to the removal of Crocker Land from Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560, I have to state that the plate of that chart has been taken in hand, with the purpose of removing Crocker Land and also for the removal of Peary Channel, which the expedition of Mylius Erichsen found not to exist, together with any other features which further search of records may show should need to be amended.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

The above correspondence shows that the Navy Department has repudiated the Peary "discoveries," as already mentioned by me.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey in 1911 published a volume entitled "Arctic Tides," which mentions the Peary Channel and Crocker Land. My resolution led to correspondence with the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which department, after due and careful investigation, has issued a "corrective slip," which is inserted in every copy of the publication, which "corrective slip" reads as follows:

CORRECTIVE NOTE TO ARCTIC TIDES.

Recent explorations have shown that Peary Channel, mentioned upon page 95 and shown upon the chart of cotidal lines as separating the extreme northern portion of Greenland from Greenland proper, does not exist; also that Crocker Land, mentioned upon pages 92 and 95, if existent, does not lie in the position indicated upon this chart.

And now the Coast and Geodetic Survey has officially repudiated all possibility of determination or verification of the fictitious line of soundings claimed to have been made by Peary on his expedition whereby he asserts that he reached the North Pole, and by such official repudiation the Coast and Geodetic Survey has officially destroyed Peary's last and only basis for his claim to the attainment of the North Pole.

I again quote from the letter of December 18, 1915, written by the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to me:

This bureau has never at any time received any data from any member of the Peary expedition of 1908-1909 which would enable a determination or verification of the geographical position of the soundings referred to in the profile of soundings furnished by Mr. Peary as a result of his 1908-1909 expedition to be made.

The geographical positions of these soundings therefore can not be verified by the survey, and each and every one of them can be accepted only as submitted.

E. LESTER JONES,
Superintendent Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Can such a repudiative decision made by the scientists of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, that department of our Government under whose orders Mr. Peary served on his last expedition—a repudiative decision reached only after careful study and thorough consideration of all the available data—be termed a perversion of history? Rather would it be a perversion of history, a perversion of geography, a perversion of science, were these fictitious results of false claims of discovery and achievement allowed to remain unchallenged on our Government maps and charts.

That this action of the Navy Department and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, resultant of my resolution of February 25, 1915, has been accepted as conclusive by the largest firm

of map and atlas publishers in this country is evidenced by the following letter received by me from Rand, McNally & Co., of New York, Chicago, and London, England:

CHICAGO, December 15, 1915.

MR. H. T. HELGESEN.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 5th is received, and we are pleased to inform you that our new series of maps—the Goode map—will, we believe, meet your requirements in the line of accuracy in every detail.

The map of the world in this series, which recently came from the press, does not show the fictitious "Crocker Land," nor the fictitious "Peary Channel." We believe that as far as authenticity is concerned these maps far surpass any series of maps on the market to-day.

Appreciating the kindly spirit of your information, and assuring you that we are glad at all times to receive data for the purposes of maintaining accuracy in our maps, we are,

Very truly, yours,

RAND, McNALLY & Co.

We have therefore the word of this leading firm of atlas and map publishers that the maps which omit "Crocker Land" and the "Peary Channel" are the most authentic of any maps on the market at this time.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I shall refer to another matter relative to the correction and reissuance of our Government maps and charts of the Arctic regions—a matter of justice. I refer to the names placed on various geographic features of the regions within the Arctic Circle, names placed thereon by the original discoverers, which names have been largely and unjustly removed and superseded by more recent explorers. I refer especially, Mr. Chairman, to those portions of northern Greenland and Grant Land which were explored and charted by an expedition under the leadership of an honorable and honored officer of the United States Army, Maj. Gen. (then Lieut.) A. W. Greely, in command of the Lady Franklin Bay expedition. The members of this expedition, working under difficulties and hardships unknown and inconceivable to explorers of this generation, explored and mapped these regions with such accuracy and fidelity to detail that, although frequently confirmed, their data as presented has never been questioned or denied by those who have followed them. Neither Gen. Greely nor the members of his expedition have ever asked or received Government favors. Gen. Greely earned his title by faithful service; it is not an empty honor bestowed on him for claimed achievements, never performed. Throughout this and other countries he is recognized and honored for what he has done, yet the names this faithful officer of the United States Army placed on our Government maps by right of priority of discovery have been omitted from our latest Government maps.

In 1876 the English explorer, Aldrich, of the expedition under command of Sir George Nares, unfurled the English flag at the northern point of Grant Land, while Sir George Nares, believing that the American explorer, Hall, had first seen that point—although Hall had not reached it—named the point Cape Columbia as a compliment to America and American explorers. In return courtesy, seven years later, Gen. Greely placed the name of "Nares Land" on the land south of Nordenskiöld Inlet, in North Greenland.

Other portions of the northern part of Greenland have been known for many years as Hall Land, Hazen Land, and Washington Land; but while these names still appear in very small type on Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560, the name of Peary Land, in glaringly large letters, is spread blatantly across these other names of honored statesmen and explorers. This, I contend, Mr. Chairman, is an injustice which should not be tolerated.

Many other names placed on the map by Gen. Greely are omitted from Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560. These names, Mr. Chairman, should not be lost from our Government maps and charts nor should they be replaced by the names given by later explorers.

The Lady Franklin Bay expedition was a Government expedition, and the Government officially accepted and printed Gen. Greely's report of the expedition, as is shown by a resolution which passed the House of Representatives—the Senate concurring—on June 17, 1886, that caused to be printed two volumes, being a report of the proceedings of the international polar expedition to Lady Franklin Bay, by First Lieut. (now Maj. Gen.) A. W. Greely. These two volumes contain maps and charts showing the various discoveries made by the Lady Franklin Bay expedition.

I have recently received a letter from Gen. Greely, which I shall quote:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 11, 1915.

To the Hon. H. T. HELGESEN,

House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your letter of December 6, referring to your resolution of February 25, 1915, it is needless to say that every

right-thinking explorer scrupulously recognizes the work of his predecessors, so that your wish to replace on future maps issued by the United States the original names given to new discoveries is right and proper. In addition, the displacing of an original set of names by others is most strongly condemned by all geographers, both as unfair and also as leading to confusion and misunderstanding.

The following original discoveries were named by me in honor of the enlisted men of the Lady Franklin Bay expedition, who participated therein. The greater number of the men paid for their accomplished duty by lingering deaths. The following names were approved by the Secretaries of War and of Navy, and were entered on the official Government map published in the official report (H. R. 49C: 1S. Mis. Doc., 393):

Capes Brainard, Frederick; Mounts Biederbick, Connell, and Whistler; and Brainard Island. For Lieut. Lockwood, who made the world's record for the farthest north, were named Cape Lockwood and Lockwood Island. For President Garfield were named Garfield Coast and Garfield Mountains. For Vice President Arthur, Mount Arthur and Arthur Land. For George Washington, Cape Washington. For E. K. Kane, Cape Kane. For the distinguished Austrian-Hungarian explorer, Weyprecht Inlet. For Admiral Sir George Nares, R. N., Nares Land—as an acknowledgement of the farthest point that could possibly be seen by his men. Schley Land for Capt. Schley, whose energy and courage rescued the survivors of my expedition. Hazen Land for Gen. Hazen, Chief Signal Officer, under whom the expedition served. Hunt Flord, for the Secretary of the Navy. Fort Conger, Conger Inlet, and Conger Mountains for Senator Conger, whose influence largely brought about the dispatch of the expedition.

Mount Grant (named for Gen. Grant), and Black Horn Cliffs were, I think, named by my predecessors, but I scrupulously retained every name given by any of my predecessors.

Trusting that the information given covers the ground to your satisfaction,

I am, yours,

A. W. GREELY,
Major General, Retired.

Commander of the Lady Franklin Bay International Polar Station.

As just stated, it was in grateful remembrance of the timely rescue of the Greely survivors, effected by the Government relief expedition under the late Admiral Winfield Scott Schley (then Capt. Schley) that Gen. Greely named one of the lands which he had discovered Schley Land. This name, with others, was jointly approved by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and was placed on United States Navy chart H. O. 963, edition of 1885, by the Hydrographer of the Navy; but it is now omitted from H. O. chart 2560 by a later Hydrographer.

In a letter dated December 29, 1915, Gen. Greely said:

Hon. H. T. HELGESEN.

DEAR SIR: Surely the men of the Lady Franklin Bay expedition have a right to express their regret that the Hydrographer of the Navy should erase from the charts of the Navy a discovery paid for by lives of the men of the Army, and should indirectly relegate, in a measure, to obscurity the services of a distinguished officer of the Navy, whose expedition in its inception and in its results engaged the attention of the civilized world.

A. W. GREELY,
Major General, United States Army, Retired.

Under date of June 4, 1915, I wrote Secretary of the Navy Daniels, asking him the following question:

Who had the audacity to remove the name of a renowned admiral of the United States Navy (Admiral Schley) from the charts of the Hydrographic Office, when that name was placed on a newly discovered land by its discoverer, Gen. Greely, an honored officer of the United States Army?

To this question I received no reply. I therefore wrote Secretary Daniels on November 29, 1915, requesting a reply to the above specific question. Apparently the Secretary of the Navy and the Hydrographer of the Navy Department did not wish to place themselves on record in writing on this matter, but under date of December 15, 1915, I received a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, which read, in part, as follows:

DECEMBER 15, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. HELGESEN: In connection with prior correspondence on the subject of Hydrographic charts Nos. 2142 and 2560, the department would state that, should you care to visit the Hydrographic Office at any time for the purpose of examination of its charts or for affording any assistance in furthering the work thereon, you will receive every consideration.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

On December 23, 1915, I called at the Hydrographic Office and verbally repeated my question to the Hydrographer, Capt. Thomas Washington: "Why was the name of 'Schley Land' omitted from Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560?" Capt. Washington informed me verbally that the authority and precedent for such action was the fact that the geographic board of Canada had officially removed the name of "Schley Land" as a subdivision of Ellesmere Island, and as the Canadian board was generally accepted as authority for geographic place names in Canadian territory the Hydrographic Office of the United States Navy Department had taken like action. Capt. Thomas Washington also informed me verbally that the geographic board of Canada had officially decided to remove all the names of subdivisions from Ellesmere Island, leaving only the comprehensive name of "Ellesmere Island" to apply to the territory thus designated. This information Capt. Thomas Wash-

ington gave me verbally, acting in his official position as Hydrographer of the United States Navy Department, in answer to a question asked by me in my official position as a Congressman of the United States.

Thereupon I wrote a letter, dated December 27, 1915, to the minister of the interior, Hon. W. J. Roche, Ottawa, Canada, in which I said:

I shall appreciate your courtesy if you will inform me if the geographic board of Canada has decided to remove the name of "Schley Land" from that subdivision of Ellesmere Island or if its omission from your map of "Franklin, 1911," was merely an inadvertence.

H. T. HELGESEN.

I am now in receipt of the following letter from Hon. W. J. Roche, minister of the interior, Canada:

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, January 4, 1916.

Hon. H. T. HELGESEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reference to yours of the 29th ultimo, regarding the omission of the name of "Schley Land" on our map of Franklin and in regard to which you ask if the geographic board of Canada had decided to remove this name from that subdivision of Ellesmere Island or if its omission was merely an inadvertence, I am informed by the chairman of the geographic board that no order has been issued by that board for the removal of the name of "Schley Land" or of any other subdivision of Ellesmere Island; these names have not been passed upon by the board. Mr. White states that the map of Franklin accompanying his Place Names in Northern Canada was transferred from the plate of a geological survey map and that the name of "Schley Land" was inadvertently omitted therefrom by the geological survey draftsmen.

Yours, faithfully,

W. J. ROCHE,

Minister of the Interior, Canada.

The minister of the interior, Canada, therefore makes the unqualified statement, in direct contradiction to Capt. Thomas Washington, that the name of Schley Land never has been removed by the geographic board of Canada.

Therefore after a period of seven months I have received a reply to my question to the Secretary of Navy; not from Secretary of the Navy Daniels, not from Capt. Thomas Washington, Hydrographer, but officially from the minister of the interior, Canada, who assures me officially that no such action as stated to me by Capt. Thomas Washington, Hydrographer, was ever taken by the geographic board of Canada.

It is an unpleasant surprise to me that a public official, Capt. Thomas Washington, Hydrographer, of the United States Navy Department, should deliberately misinform a Congressman on a matter of public interest connected with his department, as Capt. Washington has done, and thus expose himself to ridicule and censure.

If a true American official, in charge of the Hydrographic Office, had learned that the name of an honored American admiral had been removed from a land discovered by an American Army officer, he would never have quoted Canadian authority on the subject; certain it is he would not have done so when no Canadian authority exists for such action; on the contrary, he would make every possible effort to replace that American name not only on our own maps but on the maps of Canada as well.

Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed this subject somewhat at length, in order that it may be a matter of record and history that the action requested in my resolution of February 25, 1915, has been taken by the scientists and heads of the interested departments of our Government, with the exception only of the replacing of "Schley Land" on our maps and charts; and now that I have proved conclusively that there is not even Canadian authority for the omission of that name, we hope that this name also will be replaced on the maps of this Government in the near future.

Hydrographic Office chart No. 2142, which I asserted should be canceled, has been canceled and withdrawn from circulation. Hydrographic Office chart No. 2560, which I insisted should be corrected, is now being corrected in line with the suggestions made by me. And, Mr. Chairman, these cancellations and corrections have not been made as the result of snap judgment or hasty or ill-considered action, but only after careful study of the facts and data which I presented.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I shall state that the Government, through the Hydrographic Office (Navy Department), should at once publish a new and accurate chart of the Arctic regions, in order that the authenticated discoveries of an American Government expedition, under the leadership of an honored officer and veteran of our Army, Maj. Gen. A. W. Greely, may be perpetuated; and that the map makers and scientists of the world may know that the fictitious "discoveries" of Robert E. Peary, heretofore shown on our maps, have been repudiated and canceled by the sworn officers and scientists of our Navy Department and of our Coast and Geodetic Survey,

with the end in view that scientific truth shall prevail and that history shall not be perverted. [Applause.]

If I have any time left I yield it back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back five minutes. Mr. FERRIS. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, as a representative in part of the city of New York I want to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], who the other day showed sympathetic interest in the harbor of New York and an intelligent comprehension of the fact that our harbor is not a local but a national proposition. Nevertheless I do not think his statement that our harbor has been discriminated against can be permitted to stand. There would be a certain advantage to the Representatives from New York in being able to pose on the floor of the House as martyrs representing a martyred community; but the facts would not bear us out.

In 1868, when this country was just emerging from the great expense of the Civil War, it nevertheless authorized the expenditure of over \$8,000,000 to improve the East River and the harbor of New York and to deepen the East River to the depth of 26 feet, a project of statesmanlike farsightedness, and, in fact, far ahead of the exact needs of that moment. Our harbor was so good that outside of that authorization we needed nothing else until the time came for the 40-foot Ambrose Channel. Then this Congress gave us that. Then we needed the development along the Bay Ridge side to the extent of 40 feet, and Congress gave us that.

Ten years ago, in the Fifty-ninth Congress, my then colleague, whose successor I now am, Col. Joseph A. Goulden, introduced in this House a proposition for a survey of the East River, and the House passed it. In the first session of the next Congress he introduced a proposition for another survey, this later one covering the entire East River, and the House passed that. Under that the War Department proceeded to make a most exhaustive survey of the needs of East River. That was reported about 1911. It went to the board of review.

As recommended by the district engineer it called for the expenditure of \$34,000,000. Our city, through our dock commissioner, did what I imagine is rather unusual. They said that while they recognized the generosity of the district engineer, we could get along with less than he had recommended, and they recommended that in one place where he had proposed a 35-foot channel the depth be reduced to 20 feet. Of course, that was done by the board of review. Another matter, which was entirely a tidal matter, was cut out by the board of review, and in the Sixty-third Congress there was recommended to this House the authorization of \$13,500,000 for a new project for the East River. At the very first session after that recommendation came into Congress the Committee on Rivers and Harbors reported it favorably and this House passed it, so that in the last 48 years the city of New York has had no legitimate complaint against the Congress of the United States in connection with the improvement of its harbor. But it will have a legitimate complaint if the project is not now adopted, because we have reached a stage in New York City where we have absolutely no frontage on channels that we can utilize for the necessary development of our harbor. Everybody knows that there is an embargo against export freight, and one of the reasons for that is that ships coming into the harbor of New York to-day can not find wharves at which to berth. It is not the fault of the city of New York. In the last year we have constructed on the North River, where there is access to them, piers and wharves which have an area of over 45 acres, and a length, counting the going in and coming out on the two sides of each wharf, of over 7 miles. We are now docking ocean liners on Fifty-sixth Street on the North River, something like 6 miles north of the Battery, where the docking commences, and we are utilizing the space. Therefore, if this Congress does not give the relief that the Sixty-third Congress recommended, for the first time in the history of Congress justice will be denied to the chief port of this country, for that is what we are. We are not a local proposition. The port of New York to-day is the largest port not only in the United States, not only in this hemisphere, but the largest port in the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time assigned for general debate has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That deposits of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium owned by the United States, including those in national forests, the Grand Canyon national monument, and the Mount Olympus national monument, but excluding those in national parks, military or other reservations, shall be subject to disposition in the form and manner provided by this act to citizens of the United States, or to any as-

sociation of such persons, or to any corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof, and in the case of coal, oil, or gas, to municipalities.

The following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "other" and insert the word "naval."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment be withdrawn and the one I propose be agreed to in its stead.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to withdraw the committee amendment and substitute another, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "military or other reservations" and insert the following: "And any lands withdrawn and reserved for military or naval uses or purposes."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of this amendment is to make clear that lands withdrawn for oil lease in naval reserves shall not be included in the general operation of the bill. The committee reporting the bill inserted the word "naval," but the question arose as to whether the word "naval" will include naval oil reservations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin to withdraw the committee amendment?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend line 3, page 1, by striking out the words "deposits of" and inserting the words "lands containing"; and, on line 4, after the word "sodium," insert the words "and deposits of said mineral."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 3, strike out the words "deposit of" and insert the words "lands containing," and, after the word "sodium," in line 4, insert "and deposits of said mineral."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill as it stands provides for the leasing of deposits of coal, oil, phosphates, potassium, sodium, and so forth. The word "deposit" is used, and probably because on the lands for which limited patents have been granted the United States is the owner of deposits reserved, but this bill not only leases deposits, but it leases lands and makes an acreage charge for the same. So it seems to me that we should provide for leasing the land containing these minerals as well as the deposits.

I assume that the Secretary of the Interior would construe the language of the section as giving him authority to lease the land, but it would be a somewhat strained construction, and it seems to me there would be a possibility that a lessee might decline to pay the per acreage charge for his land and insist that the bill did not authorize the Secretary to lease the land. That is the real important provision of the bill—the leasing of land containing these mineral deposits. If it were not for the reservation contained in the limited patents that have been issued, it would not be necessary to use the word "deposits" at all. I think the amendment should be adopted, because without it there would be considerable question whether the bill authorizes the Secretary to actually lease the land.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, the section under consideration has been submitted to the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey and to the Secretary of the Interior. They have all made a report on it. The thought of the committee was that, inasmuch as it became necessary later to dispose of the surface, so it might be used for agriculture and deposits used for mineral development, we were pursuing the right course, as we did in the Alaska coal fields. We provide later on for the use of the surface for coal machinery, and so forth.

Mr. MONDELL. What the gentleman says is true, but it is a fact that we do actually lease the land. The bill contemplates the leasing of land, and there will be many leases where all the surface goes with the lease. Let me call attention to another matter which has occurred to me since the discussion began. The second section provides for the sale of coal lands under the present coal-land laws. These coal-land laws provide for the disposition of lands and all they contain; not only the coal, but any other mineral; and if the first section of your bill does not contain a provision under which the lands may be disposed of, your next section is not operative to the full extent that it is intended it should be.

Mr. FERRIS. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on page 24 the bill makes provision for such deposits and for any part of the land which is necessary to carry on the work? On page 21, section 20, we reserve acres for camp

sites or any other work necessary. While I do not say that the gentleman is not right, the fact that the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines and the Secretary of the Interior have passed upon it would seem to be sufficient.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; but those gentlemen, who have not had much to do with drafting land legislation, might be mistaken. So far as the general rule of leasing is concerned, it is also true that we will lease the land and all it contains, make an acreage charge, and in certain cases only does the bill provide that a part of the surface may be retained.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment may not be agreed to at this time. I shall talk with the gentleman about it and consult some members of the committee, and if the gentleman is right we can return to it later. I am of opinion that the amendment would meet with some opposition even in the West, where I know they want to utilize the surface for agriculture, and our thought was to lease the minerals and leave the surface undisturbed.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would not in any wise interfere with the taking of a limited right, but it would make it clear that we are authorizing the Secretary to lease the lands as well as merely the deposits. The bill contemplates that once a lease is made thereafter no limited right may be acquired; if there is to be any reservation of the surface you provide that reservation shall be in advance of the lease. Let me make this suggestion to the gentleman. I do not know that that is so important that it would nullify a part of the intent of the bill if it were left out, and yet I think it is important. If the committee has no objection, I should be very glad to have the matter go over.

Mr. FERRIS. We can return to it if we find we are in error about it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Wyoming that the only legislative thing done in the first section is to define who shall be qualified to take a lease. All the rest of the matter in that section is descriptive. The question the gentleman raises with reference to lands and deposits on lands is specifically covered when we come to treat of different deposits; and I will say to the gentleman that the language of the bill as originally introduced last year did contain the word "lands" as he now seeks to have it amended, and it was because of objection from Western States that it was feared that that might be construed as general authority to lease lands, and therefore might in some way modify our surface land laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If the gentleman will allow me, I think he is scarcely correct when he says that this first section is descriptive. The first section is the all-important section of the bill; without this first section there would be no authority in the Secretary of the Interior or anyone else to lease any of these lands. It is the section which provides that certain of these lands and deposits may be disposed of as thereafter provided. There is no authority to do that now.

Mr. LENROOT. I call the gentleman's attention to section 3, relating to coal, where the Secretary is authorized upon competition, and so forth (dropping to line 25), to grant leases of the lands or the deposits therein through advertisement or competitive bids, and that is complete in itself.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, that is all the more reason why the first section should be made harmonious with the third section and with the second section. It is true that the third section when it comes to treat the matter of coal does refer to land. The second section does refer to lands, not in the language of the section but by reference to the statute. The first section, which is the one which lays down the new rule, which provides the new procedure, should be in harmony with what follows in the bill and what is contemplated by it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. The second paragraph does nothing more than to preserve the present law with reference to coal.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; and that law provides for the sale of lands, not the surface, not the deposits, but all that the land contains, and fee title is conveyed. The land is sold with the coal and any other mineral which it may contain. The title is a complete fee and there is no proposition of deposits, so that when you in the first section treat of deposits, and then in the second section attempt to or do, as a matter of fact, revive and retain the present coal-land law, which treats of lands and not deposits, your first section does not harmonize with the balance of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming withdraws the pro forma amendment, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

COAL.

SEC. 2. That classified coal lands or deposits of coal belonging to the United States, exclusive of those in Alaska, may, unless an offering, an application for offering, or an application for lease is pending hereunder, be acquired in accordance with the provisions of sections 2347 to 2352, inclusive, of the United States Revised Statutes, and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, or such lands or deposits may be leased, as hereinafter provided.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not want to unnecessarily detain the committee, but this section so clearly indicates the necessity for the amendment that I offered to the first section that I want to emphasize the matter. As matters now stand, coal lands may be acquired at classified prices under what we call the coal-land law. The purchaser secures a fee title. This section says that classified coal lands may be disposed of, but the first section is the section which authorizes this retention of the coal-land law and the enactment of the detailed provisions which follow relative to the leasing of land. It may be there are those somewhere in the West who are so much opposed to the thought or idea of leasing that they dislike to have the word "lands" and the word "leasing" brought into conjunction, but we are proposing to lease lands.

That is what we are proposing to do here. We are proposing to sell land, and the only deposits we lease are the deposits contained in the lands which have been entered under a limited title, reserving the mineral to the United States. Therefore, if this bill is to be made harmonious, there should be an amendment to the first section such as I have suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] withdraws his pro forma amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to, and upon the petition of any applicant qualified under this act shall, divide any of the coal lands or the deposits of coal, classified and unclassified, owned by the United States outside of the Territory of Alaska, into leasing blocks or tracts of 40 acres each, or multiples thereof, and in such form as, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, will permit the most economical mining of the coal in such blocks, but in no case exceeding 2,560 acres in any one leasing block or tract; and thereafter the Secretary of the Interior shall, in his discretion, from time to time, upon the request of any applicant qualified under this act or on his own motion, offer such lands or deposits of coal for leasing, and, upon a royalty fixed by him in advance, shall award leases thereof through advertisement, by competitive bidding, or, in case of lignite or low-grade coals, such other methods as he may by general regulations adopt, to any person above the age of 21 years who is a citizen of the United States, or to any association of such persons, or to any corporation or municipality organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory thereof: *Provided*, That no railroad or other common carrier shall be permitted to take or acquire through lease or permit under this act any coal lands or deposits of coal in excess of such area or quantity as may be required and used solely for its own use, and such limitation of use shall be expressed in all leases or permits issued to railroads or common carriers hereunder. That such a railroad or common carrier may be permitted to take under the foregoing provisions not to exceed one lease hereunder upon and for each 200 miles of its line in actual operation. The term "railroad" or "common carrier" as used in this act shall include any company or corporation owning or operating a railroad, whether under a contract, agreement, or lease, and any company or corporation subsidiary or auxiliary thereto, whether directly or indirectly connected with such railroad or common carrier.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 2, in line 12, insert, after the word "any," the word "qualified," and after the word "applicant" strike out of lines 12 and 13 the words "qualified under this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 22, after the word "any," insert the word "qualified," and strike out, in lines 22 and 23, the words "qualified under this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, after the word "any," in line 3, strike out the following: "person above the age of twenty-one years who is a citizen of the United States, or to any association of such persons, or to any corporation or municipality organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory thereof," and insert in lieu thereof the words, "qualified applicant."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, after the word "carrier," in line 23, insert:

"But shall not include spurs, switches, or branch lines operated by any lessee and necessary to connect the mine with the line or lines of any railroad or other common carrier."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

This section contains, it seems to me, three very objectionable features, and yet I shall offer no amendment to it. In order to amend the section and have the amendment harmonious with the balance of the bill the amendment would have to be of considerable length and contain a number of propositions. I did offer such an amendment last year, and, of course, the chairman was able to place me at a disadvantage by saying the amendment was so long and contained so many propositions that no member of the committee could understand them all, and therefore no one would vote for them. That was sound logic. It is impossible to amend features of this bill that I think ought to be amended without full consent of the gentleman in charge, because any considerable change would require an amendment of very considerable length and involve a number of propositions, and while some members of the committee might agree to one proposition they would not agree to the others. So, what I am saying about this section I am saying for the benefit of the gentlemen when they shall appear in conference, assuming that elsewhere there may be some changes made, which is likely to happen.

The first of the objections to this section is fundamental. It is an objection to all legislation of this kind because of the fact that it grants no rights to any American citizen. It gives no one any assurance that under any circumstances may he be certain of being able to secure a lease. We simply give the Secretary of the Interior authority to do certain things, and we leave it entirely in his discretion whether he shall do them or not. That is a very radical departure from our past legislation, all of which has been in the nature of the grant of certain rights or privileges or opportunities. No right, privilege, or opportunity is granted in this bill from cover to cover, except one that I shall refer to later on that should not be granted, except as it may please the Secretary of the Interior to grant them. That is the first objection.

The second objection is one that I called attention to last year in connection with the discussion of the Alaskan bill. Now, we are starting out to lease public coal lands. There are 19,000,000 classified acres of them, and will eventually be twice as great an area if all are classified. In one place in my State there is a single coal field that is about 30 miles wide and nearly 100 miles long. It will be a great many years, it will be generations, it will be hundreds of years, before all of this land is used. Some of it probably never will be mined. In providing for the leasing of these areas we should provide merely that the Secretary of the Interior may lease to applicants, or that applicants may secure leases, within the prescribed limits as to compactness and acreage. That would be a very simple proposition. It is the sort of provision that would naturally occur to anyone drafting a leasing bill, but it is not the sort of a provision that would occur to a bureau chief, because that sort of provision would not give the bureau chief and his bureau much to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. That kind of a provision would not give the bureau chief or bureau much of anything to do in connection with the granting of the lease. The individual would go out on the public domain, find a tract of land he desired to lease, apply for it, and the Secretary would determine whether or not it were in properly compact form; and all the conditions being complied with, the lease would be granted and the bureau would not come in at all. What has been done in this bill is not to provide that the Secretary may lease or that applicants may acquire leases, but that the Secretary of the Interior shall divide up into leasing blocks all of the public lands of the United

States containing coal. If we really expect to do that, we can not hope to lease an acre of this land within the next 10 years.

Let us take the situation in Alaska. There are only a couple of fields there which people desire to lease. They are small. This provision contained in the Alaskan bill is not a particularly onerous or trying one, because the acreage and the area is small; and yet in response to a recent inquiry made of the Secretary of the Interior I was informed that they could not receive applications because the land had not been divided into leasing blocks. We passed the bill on the assumption that the people wanted to lease immediately, and that we must open the coal fields of Alaska immediately. But I have been informed that no applications for lease could be considered, because the department had not even started on the work of dividing these coal lands up into leasing blocks.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman is aware of the fact that until the railroad gets to these coal fields there is no possibility of offering any of them?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, the gentleman who is now speaking developed a coal mine many years ago, 160 miles from the nearest railway, and had the mine opened, the entries driven, the chambers developed, and the mine ready for production when the railroad reached us, and that work required something like two years before the railroad came. I object to this because it is so unnecessary. No man would ever have thought of it or dreamed of it, except a bureau chief who wants work for his bureau.

If you had a lot of land to lease and were willing to lease it, providing the lessee would conform to certain requirements as to compactness and certain limitations as to area, would you not say to him, "Go out and let us know what you would like to lease"? Or would you say, "We are going to survey this and lay it out and determine just how much you should want and how much you should have. While it is true you may want four sections, yet we will divide some of it into 40-acre tracts"? The fact is that no one can pick out a coal-mine location for some one else. There are so many questions to be considered, questions of the thickness and depth and situation of the veins, questions as to the best point of attack, questions as to the location of tracts, where the entries must be driven for economical mining, and so on. That costs money, lots of money. In some cases a hundred thousand dollars has been spent before the parties knew just where they could advantageously attack a coal vein.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the gentleman's shaft of criticism, it is leveled purely against the leasing system, as suggested by this bill, and not that the provisions here as to leasing will conflict in any way with the old system, which is carried on and continued by this bill.

Mr. MONDELL. All of which proves to what little purpose, apparently, I have discussed this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more, because I do not want my position to be misunderstood.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], if he had listened at all to the discussion here in times past, should know that I have accepted the leasing idea as to coal and oil long since; that I have introduced coal-leasing bills for a number of years. I believe that whether we like it or not we shall come to leasing of coal and oil lands. I do believe there are real benefits to be had from leasing. If the gentleman had done me the honor to listen yesterday to my remarks, he would know that real benefits are to be secured by public control and leasing. If I had my way, I would have the leasing in the hands of the States; but I realize that that can not be accomplished. I believe that you can obtain benefits in the way of safety, and in the elimination of waste, and in the larger returns which the community receives as its mineral

wealth is exhausted, providing you have the right kind of law. The only trouble with this bill is that it is not the right kind of leasing law.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not the Mondell law.

Mr. MONDELL. I have no interest in this matter except to make the bill workable. I do not know any reason why we should invite the departments to spend millions of dollars in developing these areas into square or oblong or rectangular blocks, blocks that will not in one case out of a thousand be the blocks that any lessee will eventually take, because when the lessee comes to take his leasehold he must take it in such a way that he can use it to advantage. The gentleman understands that. The lessee must reach the vein economically and so that he can handle it in an economical way; he must have trackage facilities; he must attack the vein from the right direction. As to all these things no one can pick and determine for him. Do you want to incur the expense of doing the prospecting work? Why should the public stand all that expense, which the miner or the lessee prefers to pay, because he realizes no one can do it for him? I can not see any reason for it. It is simply inviting a vast public expenditure and inviting long delays before leases can be made, and will result in unsatisfactory conditions after it is all done.

Now, so much for that. There is another provision in the bill in this section relative to leases that I do not like. There is a great deal of a difference of opinion as to the basis upon which you should fix the royalties. The royalties are fixed in the bill on a competitive basis. I think that is a very great mistake. If I were going to draw the bill I would have Congress fix the royalties or provide at least a minimum and a maximum; I would have Congress say something about it. But I would, however, very much prefer to leave the question of royalty to the Secretary of the Interior rather than have a provision like this, under which, after a man has gone to all the expense of prospecting and deciding and determining the location, dip, trend, and character of the vein, his lease is put up to the highest bidder and some fellow who has not spent a dollar, who has had no interest in the matter up to that time, may, by bidding a bonus over and above the royalty fixed by the Secretary, take away from him that which he has spent his time and money on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 12, after the word "use," insert the words "which quantity shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, all legislation necessarily should be as specific as possible. This section provides—

That no railroad or other common carrier shall be permitted to take or acquire through lease or permit under this act any coal lands or deposits of coal in excess of such area or quantity as may be required and used solely for its own use.

Now, what does that term "use" apply to? It says:

And such limitation of use shall be expressed in all leases or permits issued to railroads or common carriers hereunder.

Then follows the provision—

That such a railroad or common carrier may be permitted to take under the foregoing provisions not to exceed one lease hereunder upon and for each 200 miles of its line in actual operation. The term "railroad" or "common carrier" as used in this act shall include any company or corporation owning or operating a railroad, whether under a contract, agreement, or lease, and any company or corporation subsidiary or auxiliary thereto, whether directly or indirectly connected with such railroad or common carrier.

Now, at some time somebody has got to determine what that term "area or quantity" means. I suppose the genial and clever gentleman from Oklahoma will say this is taken care of in some other part of this bill, but I can not find it taken care of.

A railroad comes in and asks for a certain quantity of land for its use. Now, for what purpose and use? To build a track upon or to mine coal for the purpose of running its locomotives and trains? If you do not place some limitation in this law, some court or somebody at some time has got to place a limitation as to what is necessary for its use. Is it not far better to place that limitation in the hands of some one in this bill than to leave it open to doubt for some one to conjure over or, finally, for some court in some far distant part of this country to determine?

The great trouble with legislation, as a rule, is that it is not definite enough, and it leaves grave opportunities for questions to be raised, especially by large corporations who have large sums of money to spend in litigation, and they can finally fight

these matters through to a position where they can get a decision in their favor. Now, I believe in placing this arbitrary power of determining the area or quantity of land that any railroad may have in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior. If it is taken care of in some other part of the bill, I would like to know it. I can not find it. Perhaps the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] can point to some section. I have been unable to find it and therefore have proposed this amendment.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Ohio has offered his amendment for the best purposes, and I know that the thing he speaks of should be done; but it is also my opinion that it is done, and if the gentleman will turn to page 27 of the bill—

Mr. EMERSON. I did not see it there.

Mr. FERRIS. It says—

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe necessary and proper rules and regulations and to do any and all things necessary to carry out and accomplish the purposes of this act.

Now let me read the paragraph where the gentleman offered his amendment on page 3:

And such limitation of use shall be expressed in all leases or permits issued to railroads or common carriers hereunder.

Now, here is a general section which gives the Secretary full power to work out all details of all sorts, and then here is the specific language in the paragraph which the gentleman seeks to amend, which says that the thing he desires shall be put in the lease, and the Secretary is given the authority to write the lease and does execute the lease. I think that gives him the power.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. EMERSON. But the Secretary of the Interior is acting in an official capacity, and the courts have ruled that if he is unfair, litigants may appeal, and people who have been wronged may appeal to the courts for mandamus against him.

Mr. STAFFORD. The courts have decided just the opposite, so far as the decisions that have gone up from the Post Office Department are concerned.

Mr. EMERSON. That may be true as to the Post Office Department, but it is not true as to this.

Mr. FERRIS. All through this bill we give the Secretary of the Interior specific authority. I am quite sure we give him special and general authority to cover this.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on this.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of five minutes, three minutes of which shall go to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and two minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in five minutes, three minutes to be assigned to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and two minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, if the provision referred to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] was a grant to the railroads by the terms of the act to take such amount of coal from the public lands as was necessary for their own use, then the point made by him would be well taken, that in that case the quantity ought to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior; but I want to call attention to the fact that whatever they get, they get under a lease issued by the Secretary of the Interior, and therefore the Secretary, in issuing the lease itself, determines the quantity which, in his judgment, is necessary for the use of the company. Then, moreover, the limitation of use must be expressed in the lease itself.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, personally I do not like the provision in the bill which authorizes a railroad company to secure a coal lease. I am one of those who believe that railroad companies should attend to the business of transportation, and that business alone, and that if they need coal they should buy it; but the provision is in the bill. I want to call the attention of the Chairman and members of the committee to this fact, or rather, I want to propound a query. A railroad company secures a lease under this act. There is a provision in section 22 of the bill under which—

No corporation shall hold any interest as a stockholder of another corporation in more than one such lease; and no person shall take or hold any interest or interests as a member of an association or associations or as a stockholder of a corporation or corporations holding a

lease under the provisions hereof which, together with the area embraced in any direct holding of a lease under this act, or which, together with any other interest or interests as a member of an association or associations or as a stockholder of a corporation or corporations holding a lease under the provisions hereof, exceeds in the aggregate an amount equivalent to the maximum number of acres allowed to any one lessee under this act.

Query: Railroad companies have a great many stockholders. If a railroad company has a lease under this act, can any stockholder in the company acquire a lease, and if so, how and under what conditions, and how much? May I hope for an answer?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That any person, association, or corporation holding a lease of coal lands or coal deposits under this act may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, upon a finding by him that it will be for the advantage of the lessee and the United States, secure a modification of his or its original lease by including additional coal lands or coal deposits contiguous to those embraced in such lease, but in no event shall the total area embraced in such modified lease exceed in the aggregate 2,560 acres.

That upon satisfactory showing by any lessee to the Secretary of the Interior that all of the workable deposits of coal within a tract covered by his or its lease will be exhausted, worked out, or removed within three years thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior may, within his discretion, lease to such lessee an additional tract of land or coal deposits, which, including the coal area remaining in the original lease, shall not exceed 2,560 acres, through the same procedure and under the same conditions as in case of an original lease.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 20, strike out the word "original" and insert the word "existing."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, there is an unimportant amendment in line 7, on page 4, which I think has not been acted upon. It is to strike out the words "a modification" and insert the word "modifications."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 7, after the word "secure," strike out "a modification" and insert "modifications."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 7. That for the privilege of mining or extracting the coal in the lands covered by his lease the lessee shall pay to the United States such royalties as may be specified in the lease, which shall be fixed in advance of offering the same, and which shall be not less than 2 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds, due and payable at the end of each month succeeding that of the extraction of the coal from the mine, and an annual rental, payable at the date of such lease and annually thereafter, on the lands or coal deposits covered by such lease, at such rate as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior prior to offering the same, which shall be not less than 25 cents per acre for the first year thereafter, not less than 50 cents per acre for the second, third, fourth, and fifth years, respectively, and not less than \$1 per acre for each and every year thereafter during the continuance of the lease, except that such rental for that year shall be credited against the royalties as they accrue for that year. Leases shall be for indeterminate periods upon condition of continued operation of the mine or mines, except when such operation shall be interrupted by strikes, elements, or casualties not attributable to the lessee, and upon the further condition that at the end of each 20-year period succeeding the date of the lease such readjustment of terms and conditions may be made as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, unless otherwise provided by law at the time of the expiration of such periods: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his judgment the public interest will be subserved thereby, in lieu of the provision herein contained requiring continuous operation of the mine or mines, provide in the lease for the payment of an annual advance royalty upon a minimum number of tons of coal, which in no case shall aggregate less than the amount of rentals herein provided for.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 6, after the word "of," at the beginning of the line, insert the words "diligent development and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to what strikes me as an omission in this section. These leases, or many of them, are to be under competitive bidding; the Secretary fixes the royalty which must be paid, and then there is to be competitive bidding. I suppose that competition might be in the offering of additional royalty or the offering of a bonus. One objection to that sort of thing is that it gives the fellow with the longest pole the chance to get all the persimmons. The man who has the ready cash for a bonus can get a lease away from a poor man who has not the bonus price. One of the arguments to persuade people that Federal leases will not be as bad as they have feared was that the poor man could open a coal mine under a lease when he could not afford to buy the land; but if he has to compete with a man who is ready to pay a bonus, then he would be no better off than he would if he had to buy the land.

But that is not what I started in to discuss. The bill provides for the bonus or additions to the royalty. But this section very clearly states what the lessee shall pay, and having set out specifically what he shall pay, nothing more can be required of him. Section 7 says:

That for the privilege of mining or extracting the coal in the lands covered by his lease—

And I want the chairman to give me his attention, because he does not want this to get away from him; he does not want to make provision for bonuses; and then let the fellow with the bank roll defeat the poor man and afterwards find that he can not collect the bonus from the lessee.

The section says:

The lessee shall pay to the United States such royalties as may be specified in the lease, which shall be fixed in advance of offering the same.

And then, a little farther down, it says:

And an annual rental, payable at the date of such lease.

And so forth.

There is thus set forth clearly in this section what the lessee is to pay, and having set forth what he is to pay he can be required to pay no more, under a proper construction of the statute.

It is true that when the lease is advertised the Secretary will expect a bonus, a bonus in cash or in additional royalty over and above the royalty which the Secretary has fixed. But in this section which determines what the lessee shall pay it is made very clear that he can not be called upon to pay anything but the royalty that the Secretary fixes in advance and his annual rental on the land. In the proper place there should be a provision that the successful bidder should also pay "such bonus or additional royalty as may have been offered by the bidder at the time of the competition." Something of that sort, it seems to me, ought to be in the bill or you will find that you can not collect these bonuses. I do not believe in the competitive bidding on leases, but if we are to have them let us provide for the payment of the bonus bid.

I want to call attention to another provision in the bill to compliment the committee. I want to emphasize the compliment, because I can not repeat it frequently in the discussion of the bill. [Laughter.] One of the difficulties in getting anyone to approve public leasing is due to the fact that at the beginning those who favored it were inclined to be so unreasonable in their requirements that it frightened everybody out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. One of the trying questions was the length of the lease. A good many people were of the opinion that leases should be very brief. They got the idea that the public should in a brief period be able to recapture, or, if not recapture, make new and different terms. That was all a mistake. There are perhaps only a few people that have my view of it, that the whole recapture idea is a mistake and will be a burden to the consumer. But in this case the committee has entirely got away from the short lease and recapture business and concluded that the proper term of a coal lease is forever and amen, for they fix an indeterminate period, which means a period that will run on forever if the lessee does the right thing.

They provide, however, that at the expiration of certain periods there may be, and shall be, a readjustment. That, in my opinion, is the form of lease that should be made, and as to that feature of the bill I am heartily in accord with the committee. I am wondering why, having been so wise with regard to the period of a coal lease, the committee turns right about face, and when they came to an oil lease made it for 20 years when, as a matter of fact, the oil operator would in many cases be subjected to greater loss at the expiration of his brief lease than would the coal operator; and if it is proper to do this, which is in the interest of the consumer of coal, in my opinion, then why should we chop off a power lease at the end of 50 years and recapture the property? It does not seem to me that the committee has been entirely consistent. While I approve this feature of the bill, I can not approve the provisions which follow, and a little later I want to discuss the provisions with regard to oil. It seems to me this very proper provision of an indeterminate lease is the same sort of provision which we should make with regard to oil leases.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I really think the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is more intelligent than he seems to be in his discussion of this question. He asks why we have an indeterminate lease in the case of coal. He asks why we have not an indeterminate lease in the case of water power. He wants to know why we have a determinate lease in the case of oil. I am sure the gentleman when he reflects must realize the purpose of those distinctions. In the first place, in the case of coal, a very large body of coal may take a very long time to exhaust. The gentleman says that he has had some experience in oil. If he has he knows that at the end of a certain period the production of an oil well decreases—is very much less than it was at the time it was first drilled and discovery made; and, therefore, in the interest of the operator, in the interest of fairness, at the end of a long period there should be opportunity to readjust the rentals and royalties, because an oil well producing 10 barrels of oil a day ought not to pay as large a royalty proportionately as an oil well producing a thousand barrels of oil a day. Then, as to water power, the gentleman ought to realize that in dealing with these resources they are entirely of a different class than dealing with water power. We are exhausting these resources in the leasing of them. A lease of oil or coal is really not properly a lease. It is an actual disposition of the very thing itself, a disposition of the coal, a disposition of the oil; but in the case of water power the same amount is there at the end of 20 years that there was in the beginning, but conditions may then have so changed that there ought to be a readjustment of the terms and conditions of the lease. In the one case we are exhausting the thing we are disposing of, or leasing, and in the other case it is not exhausted at all.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am sure that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is more intelligent than one might judge from his discussion. I am sure he is. He says that we should have an indeterminate lease on coal and not on oil, because a coal mine lasts longer than an oil well. It may last 20 or 30 or 40 or 50 years, whereas an oil well may not last so long, therefore the coal lease should be for a long period, he says, forgetting, evidently, that he does not approve a long or indeterminate lease on it, but we should not have an indeterminate water power, which lasts forever. There may be some logic in that sort of argument, but I do not gather it. The only interest we have as legislators, or should have—and I am sure the only interest we have—is to give the people the very best benefits from the use and development of these resources. We want the largest developments, and we want the people to secure the products at the lowest price, and we will do that most effectively as we least disturb the tenure, because the moment you disturb the tenure you give an excuse for piling up charges to pay for the losses incident to the disturbance of the tenure. Therefore this is a very excellent provision. An oil well, it is true, does not ordinarily last as long as a coal mine, but that is no reason why the lease should not also be indeterminate. It may last longer, but in any case there is no reason why the royalty should not be readjusted at frequent intervals.

If it be deemed wise to readjust the royalty at more frequent intervals in the case of oil than in the case of coal, I should not quarrel with that kind of a proposition. I think it might be wise, but there is not, in my opinion, any reason why there should be a limitation in the lease in the case of oil and no limitation in the period of lease in the case of coal. The basic facts are these: We want large development, we want cheap service, and in my opinion we shall secure them most effectively as we allow these enterprises, always under public control, to run along in the even tenor of their way, without sudden changes in the conditions that surround them that may cause great losses which will be borne not by the operators but by the consumer, for finally it all comes back to the man who buys the current, the man who buys the oil, the man who buys the coal. He is eventually the burden bearer, and therefore we make a very great mistake if we imagine we can lay burdens or put obstacles in the way of development that will not eventually be placed on his shoulder.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That in order to provide for the supply of strictly local and domestic needs for fuel, the Secretary of the Interior may, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe in advance, issue to any applicant qualified to obtain a lease under section 3 of this act a limited license or permit granting the right to prospect for, mine, and dispose of coal belonging to the United States on specified tracts, not to exceed 10 acres in any one coal field, for a period of not exceeding 10 years, on such conditions, not inconsistent with this act, as in his opinion will safeguard the public interest, without payment of royalty for the coal mined or for the land occupied: *Provided*, That not more than one such limited license or permit shall be issued to any single applicant hereunder: *And provided further*, That in the case of municipal corporations the Secretary of the Interior may issue such limited

license or permit, for not to exceed 160 acres, upon condition that such municipal corporations will mine the coal therein under proper conditions and dispose of the same without profit: *And provided further*, That the acquisition or holding of a lease under the preceding sections of this act shall be no bar to the acquisition of such tract or operation of such mine under said limited license.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman from Wyoming wish to be heard on this section? I was going to ask unanimous consent not to read the part that was stricken out.

Mr. MONDELL. I want to be heard on this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As a matter of fact, I do not want to be heard on this section. I think the section is all right, but I do want to refer to a matter that has temporarily escaped me.

This legislation with regard to coal contains no provision for preliminary prospecting. The oil sections of the bill provide for a prospecting permit. The coal sections of the bill do not. I think it is a very great mistake not to make such provision. The gentlemen want to have their legislation harmonious. They will remember they had a provision for an exclusive prospecting period on water-power sites, a provision which, in my opinion, was altogether unnecessary and might in some cases lead to great injury and hardship, because all there is to do on a water site is to survey, and half a dozen surveying parties, if they are friendly and decent, can survey at the same time the same territory. I have frequently seen it done. But no two men can amicably or profitably prospect the same ground for minerals with a view of opening a mine.

It will not charge the committee, or any member of the committee with having drafted this bill, but whoever drafted it evidently had in mind a developed coal field. Let us imagine such a coal field as there is down in the district represented by our honored friend, the chairman, where the vein lies under comparatively level ground at a uniform depth below the surface and is practically the same in character wherever found. A shaft can be sent down almost anywhere, and the place to open the mines is the point along the line of the railroad, already built, where you can get a sidetrack. That is all there is to it. And if that were the situation everywhere it would not be necessary to have a prospecting permit.

If I may be allowed to refer to a little personal experience, I will say that years ago I spent over two years of very hard work and a great deal of other people's money and a little of my own trying to find a certain place in a coal vein where the coal was thick enough and good enough and the conditions were such as to make it possible to successfully open a mine. That period of prospecting was a long, arduous, and expensive one, and my experience was a common one in the development of coal fields. If we are to lease these lands, we certainly ought to give the prospective lessee an opportunity to go on the land, to prospect the ground, to determine the proper point in which to attack the vein, and to determine the areas which he needs for his development. And I think two years would be brief enough. We provide for that under a water-power bill, where it is not necessary. We provide for it under the oil section of this bill, but we make no provisions here, and nobody has told us why.

Mr. FERRIS. The committee has transposed phosphates and oil in the bill. We just took up the phosphate provision bodily and transposed it. I ask unanimous consent to omit the reading of the phosphate provision entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment commencing on line 20, page 7, and extending to and ending on line 7, page 10, be omitted and the amendment be adopted. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OIL AND GAS.

SEC. 14. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to grant to any applicant qualified under this act a prospecting permit, which shall give the exclusive right, for a period not exceeding two years, to prospect for oil or gas upon not to exceed 640 acres of lands wherein such deposits belong to the United States and are located within 10 miles from any producing oil or gas well, and upon not to exceed 2,560 acres of land wherein such deposits belong to the United States and are situated over 10 miles from any producing oil or gas well, upon condition that the permittee shall begin drilling operations within six months from the date of the permit, and shall, within one year from and after the date of permit, drill for oil or gas to an aggregate depth of not less than 500 feet, and shall, within two years from date of the permit, drill for oil or gas to an aggregate depth of not less than 2,000 feet. Whether the lands sought in any such application and permit

are surveyed or unsurveyed the applicant shall, prior to filing his application for permit, locate such lands in a reasonably compact form and according to the legal subdivisions of the public land surveys, if the land be surveyed; and in an approximately square or rectangular tract if the land be an unsurveyed tract, the length of which shall not exceed two and one-half times its width, and if he shall cause to be erected upon the land for which a permit is sought, a monument not less than 4 feet high, at some conspicuous place thereon, and shall post a notice in writing on or near said monument, stating that an application for permit will be made within 30 days after date of said notice, the name of the applicant, the date of the notice, and such a general description of the land to be covered by such permit by reference to courses and distances from such monument and such other natural objects and permanent monuments as will identify the land, stating the amount thereof in acres, he shall during the period of 30 days following such marking and posting, be entitled to a preference right over others to a permit for the land so identified. The applicant shall, within 90 days after receiving a permit, mark each of the corners of the tract described in the permit upon the ground with permanent monuments, so that the boundaries can be readily traced, and shall post in a conspicuous place upon the lands a notice that such permit has been granted and a description of the lands covered thereby: *Provided*, That in the Territory of Alaska prospecting permits may be granted for periods not exceeding four years, actual drilling operations shall begin within two years from date of permit, and oil and gas wells shall be drilled to a depth of not less than 500 feet within three years from date of the permit and to an aggregate depth of not less than 2,000 feet within four years from date of permit: *And provided further*, That in said Territory the applicant shall have a preference right over others to a permit for land identified by temporary monuments and notice posted on or near the same, for six months following such marking and posting, and upon receiving a permit he shall mark the corners of the tract described in the permit upon the ground with permanent monuments within one year after receiving such permit.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 10, line 9, strike out the figures "14" and insert "9."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 10, line 10, after the word "such," insert the words "necessary and proper."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 12, line 1, after the word "traced," insert the words "on the ground."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

We have reached the section of the bill relating to oil and gas and the provision relative to a prospecting permit, to which I referred a moment ago. The provision for a prospecting permit is a most excellent one. The committee, however, has laid down an arbitrary rule as to the size of the prospecting permit which it seems to me is not wise or reasonable.

The committee evidently proceeds on the assumption that land within 10 miles of a producing well is in the nature of developed oil territory, and that the land beyond is new, virgin, wild-cat territory. Well, that is rather a violent assumption. No hard-and-fast rule can be laid down. Land within half a mile of a producing well may be the most unlikely of all the land for miles around, from a productive standpoint. It may be in an entirely different geological horizon. Faults may occur that radically change conditions. A well located near the base of an anticlinal may be the outside limit of successful or profitable production. The provision fixing a certain acreage here and a certain acreage there in these prospecting leases, depending on distance from a producing well, is purely arbitrary and not based on any rule of reason.

But what I want to call attention to is something that follows this. I want to discuss it briefly now, and I shall want to discuss it more fully on the next section. This is a leasing bill, so taken and accepted, and so "denominated in the bond"; and yet, so far as oil is concerned, it is a law under which we propose to give away, without money and without price, 25 per cent of all the oil lands of the country.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] held me up to scorn—as I assume he supposed—when the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] was addressing the House, when he said that I proposed to give to those developing power public lands at the rate of \$1.25 to \$20 an acre. Of course, my theory is that a piece of public land that is not worth over \$1.25 an acre ought not to be sold for more than \$1.25 an acre. If some one will take such land and develop water power on it, he will do a good thing for the community.

Mr. FERRIS. He will turn around and put a water power on that he gets for \$1.25 and give it a valuation of \$15,000,000 and base his price to be charged to the consumer upon that; and that

is what they are doing out there. That is what we wanted to prevent here.

Mr. MONDELL. The Secretary, under the power bill, will in certain cases fix the rates. In most cases it is controlled by the States. He is not supposed to fix rates that will be confiscatory. Of course, if a power company can take land that is worth \$1.25 and assume that it is worth \$15,000,000 and fix a rate based on \$15,000,000 and get the Secretary or a State public-service commission to fix or approve rates based on such a valuation, injustice is done; but we can not assume anything of the kind will be allowed. The gentleman would have us believe that after all we were going to be gobbled up by these corporations; that the communities and public-service commissions will neither protect themselves nor the public. What will you do?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman is aware of the fact that whatever the value of the water power is, the right-of-way value can not be considered as the value of the property itself, as it would be if it were in private ownership.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I would like to have a little more time.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming may have five minutes more, and that at the expiration of that time debate on this paragraph close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. EMERSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee to explain in a minute or two why he gives so much time to Alaska? He gives four years. On page 12, line 4, the bill reads:

Provided, That in the Territory of Alaska prospecting permits may be granted for a period not exceeding four years.

Mr. FERRIS. If the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] will yield to me just a moment, I think I can explain it.

Mr. MONDELL. Very well.

Mr. FERRIS. In the conditions of Alaska, some parts of Alaska, they can work all the year round, particularly along the coast, but elsewhere they can work only in the summer, so that in hauling machinery in there, with their poor facilities and lack of railroads, much more time is required. Representatives of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines came before us and explained that there should be a little more latitude given up there so that they could get material in.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming will proceed.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] reminds us that the fear expressed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], his colleague on the committee, is unfounded; that we are not going to allow rates to be fixed on a fictitious valuation of water-power sites any more. Would a public-service commission in a State approve a rate based on such fictitious value?

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman permit me to answer?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. In the gentleman's bill he proposed a grant of these sites, and that grant being made, no public-service commission of any State could do otherwise than give to that corporation, in fixing the rate, the value in the market of that grant, while under our proposition it is expressly provided that they shall take nothing for the value of it.

Mr. MONDELL. All of which is the gentleman's opinion, but none of which is true. [Laughter.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. MONDELL. If I can have another minute. I want to talk about this next section. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Perhaps the gentleman does not know that in the West public-service commissions to-day are doing the very thing that he says is not true.

Mr. MONDELL. They must have some very weak sisters of public-service commissions. That is not the situation in my State. The value of such a site, in addition to what it costs, is the value of the improvements and betterments. That would be a fair basis of rates anywhere.

Mr. FERRIS. Some States not only have weak public-service corporations, but some States do not have any at all.

Mr. MONDELL. There is only one State in that situation.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, no; there are several.

Mr. MONDELL. I repeat what I have said here before, that I do not agree with the gentleman that if there is a State in the Union that will not protect itself you can protect it successfully from Washington. I am paying more for my electric light right here in Washington than I pay in the little berg in Wyoming in which I live; and if Federal control is such a good thing why on earth do we not get to work and reduce the rates here in this city where coal is so cheap and where there is enormous water power undeveloped right at our doors?

In the minute I have remaining I want to call the attention to the next section of this bill, under which, speaking of giving things away, the gentlemen of the committee propose to grant in fee simple oil lands that may be worth anywhere from \$1,000,000 to \$20,000,000; 640-acre tracts of land are given away. You remember the old jingle:

This is the day they give babies away
With a half a pound of tea.

This is the day when we give away 640 acres, right on the dome of the best oil fields in the West, to any fellow who wants to come along and take it. That is the provision of your bill. When it comes to giving things away, subsidizing corporations, handing out the public domain, here is a lovely provision, the like of which no one ever dreamed of until this bill was submitted. I will venture this assertion: That if any gentleman from the West had brought in a bill containing such a provision as is the next section he would have lost every shred of standing that he ever had or hoped to have in the House and would have been pilloried here and elsewhere the country over as the most unprincipled and conscienceless looter of the public domain that ever came down the trail. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Wyoming—

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this section has been closed.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma may have five minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. No; go ahead. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 15. That upon establishing to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that valuable deposits of oil or gas have been discovered within the limits of the land embraced in any permit, the permittee shall be entitled to a patent for one-fourth of the land embraced in the prospecting permit, such area to be selected by the permittee in compact form and according to the legal subdivisions of the public-land surveys, if the land be surveyed, or to be surveyed at his expense in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations governing the survey of placer mining claims if located upon unsurveyed lands: *Provided, That all merchantable timber upon land patented hereunder shall be reserved to the United States to be cared for, used, or disposed of in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, and such reservation shall be expressed in each patent issued hereunder: Provided further, That each permittee who desires to secure a patent under the terms of this section shall, within 90 days from and after discovery of valuable deposits of oil or gas in the land embraced in his permit, file in the land office of the district in which the land is located, his application for patent for the tract selected, in default of which he shall be required to thereafter pay royalty for the oil or gas produced therefrom during the remainder of the term covered by his permit, as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, and the tract and deposits of oil or gas therein shall thereafter be subject to lease as prescribed in section 16 hereof.*

The following committee amendment was read:

Page 12, line 19, strike out the figures "15" and insert the figures "10."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is to be considerable debate on this section, and I suggest to the chairman of the committee that it go over until to-morrow morning.

Mr. FERRIS. That is what I intended to do. I move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CULLOP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 406) to authorize the exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HOWELL, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for three days on account of illness.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The letter of the Secretary of the Navy, with reference to estimates was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and it should have been referred to the Com-

mittee on Appropriations. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. HELVERING, be allowed to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas be allowed to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, it is not my intention to take any length of time in discussing the proposition, but I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the rural-credit bill which will be introduced in the House will not, in my opinion, fill the needs of the people in the district where I live, and therefore I introduced a bill a few days ago. To-day my purpose in rising is to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of that bill. It is somewhat lengthy, and I will not take the time to read it, but will ask unanimous consent to print it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of rural credits. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RURAL CREDITS—THE NEED OF A SYSTEM WHICH WILL BRING RELIEF WITHOUT UNDUE DELAY.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to introduce a bill dealing with rural credits. All political parties were on record as favoring legislation which would bring relief to those who are engaged in agriculture, and it was my hope and belief that the responsible committee would report a measure which would be practical and which would bring relief needed at the lowest possible cost.

Disillusionment came with the introduction of the bill favored by the commission in the Sixty-third Congress. That bill was not scientific, and it held out no certain promise of relief. It was founded on the theory that each community could and would capitalize a land bank. It provided no machinery by which the bonds of these community banks could find a market, and, therefore, in all probability they could and would sell only to the people of the community in which the bank was located. People in other communities could not well judge of the security behind such bonds; and to invest in them, with such lack of knowledge, would be a gamble pure and simple.

I pointed out that error in public addresses as to the bill introduced in the last Congress, and it is gratifying to learn that its author has come around to the same point of view. At least, he now favors the linking of the community units with regional banks, and by so doing gives greater assurance of the marketing of the bonds. However, I do wish to call attention to the statement of the gentleman from Indiana incorporated in Document No. 679 of the Sixty-third Congress. In that statement he opposed the centralization of a land-bank system and defended the plan of individual banks. He said:

As a result it (the commission) became convinced that the system outlined in the bill which it had formulated possessed advantages which a central bank would not possess and encouraged competitive banking to an extent that would not be possible under a bill providing for a central institution.

In answer to the above I felt compelled to say:

Not one argument advanced removes the objection to small units or disproves the advantage of a system linked closely together and at all times under Federal control.

The arguments in favor of the Federal Reserve Banking System and its assured success furnish the evidence as to the need of the regional reserve system as applied to land banks.

Furthermore, the attempt to install township units, privately managed and conducted for private gain, would militate against the sale of the bonds. Land bonds would have only a local value, for there would be so many of them and at such varying prices that there would be no stability in value to attract either the investor who is looking for a safe investment for himself or for the placing of trust funds. The ability to market a bond at a low rate of interest is linked with the known safety of the security. Under the bill favored by the commission there would not and could not be such stability. Under the measure which I advocate the security would be equal to that of any Government bond, and would in time of stress have a greater value, for the reason that it would not only have the guaranty of the Government, but would have behind it assured assets which could not be destroyed.

And while the guaranty of the Government is an essential in removing suspicion and in breaking down the prejudice of

the unenlightened, it does not necessarily follow that such guaranty will entail any expense upon the Government. The security behind the bond is more than ample to protect the Government, and when the time comes that we can secure the adoption by the States of better methods of registration of titles, transfers, and, if possible, the elimination of exemption clauses, these bonds will be the best known form of investment in the country at the rate of interest permitted.

And the bill now presented by the gentleman from Indiana is an admission that he has seen his error and now favors the centralization of the land-bank system. He was wrong in 1914, and I believe that he is wrong in 1916; and it is in the hope that I can centralize attention on the errors and secure certain relief for those engaged in agriculture that I have introduced a rural-credits bill, and now issue this statement.

My opposition to the measure recommended by the commission is based on the belief that any benefits to accrue from it are problematic. Somewhere, at some time, and in some way it holds out hope, but the success of the measure would depend wholly upon the readiness of local capital to invest in unit banks and upon the readiness of capital in general to invest in regional banks. In each case its success would depend upon the assurance that capital invested would earn a profit. If it did, it would be at the expense of the borrower; and if it did not, the system would surely fail.

A very clever writer once described the inhabitants of the earth, animal and human, as being infested with fleas. The larger fleas provided sustenance to smaller fleas, and so on ad infinitum. This thought is forcibly impressed upon me when I read the measure brought forward by the commission. The efforts of humanity have been largely directed to the elimination of some of the fleas which trouble us, but he would reverse that policy and provide for the establishment of an entirely new class of interest-earning fleas to prey upon the landowners. He would have local bank units taking toll in each community, and he would have another set of interest absorbers higher up whose duty it would be to see that the regional banks were profitable—all at the expense of the landowners.

While the American people are partial to independent banks, yet we all know that the incentive to establish such banks lies in the opportunity to earn unusual profits. Remove that incentive and the number of banks would not be sufficient for the ordinary needs of business. The desire to make these enormous profits was well shown by Comptroller Williams in his recently published statement as to the usurious rates charged, not in isolated sections but all over the country. If the land banks were in position to earn large profits they would fall short of giving the maximum amount of relief to the landowners—and that should be the primary object of any legislation enacted. If they did not earn such profit they would not attract capital; if they did earn large profits, then the farmers would have to carry that extra load.

True, it might be that the spirit of cooperation would induce communities to found such banks, such as has often been done as to community stores and elevators, without regard to profit. The commission which is responsible for the Moss bill is on record as pointing out the difference between conditions in the United States and those in Germany. These conditions can not be changed in generations and they afford the best argument why a purely cooperative system is foredoomed to failure. Not one of the men who favor cooperative banks have been able to explain away these conditions. The European farmers, living on the same land for generations, from forebears down to the present holders; men of the same common blood and living in close proximity to each other know each others limitations and possibilities and furnish the soil upon which cooperation thrives. In America, where few men have more than a slight knowledge of their neighbors, where the spirit of individuality is fostered, and where suspicion is more often found than confidence, each man wants to work out his own destiny and does not favor the cooperation which would lift up his neighbor while it may benefit himself.

We have to deal with conditions and not theories, and the commission has pointed out the very reason why cooperation would be but an experiment and one in which we could not pin faith of success.

Here I wish to insert the exact language used by the commission in its report. It is pertinent and applies to the bill introduced by the committee, as well as to any bill which is based on cooperation. The commission said:

In considering the conditions in Germany as applying to the conditions in the United States, the essential points of difference between the two countries should always be borne in mind. In size the German Empire is about equal to the area of Texas, after cutting off from

Texas an area as large as the State of Alabama. In population the German Empire contains about 68,000,000 people, or more than two-thirds of the population of the whole United States. In intensive farming the Germans are ahead of our own farming population, and the average production in Germany has increased greatly, while our average yield per acre has increased but slowly. In Germany the population in a given district is largely homogeneous and the individual is, so to speak, attached to the soil, the same farms continuing in the same families for generations. In this country such a condition is seldom found. In Germany, on account of the limited supply of land and the large population, and on account of the known productivity of each piece of land, the value of that land is easily ascertained and varies within very slight limits. In this country the variations in value are very great. In Germany the average farm is about 20 acres; in this country the average farm is about 138 acres. In Germany the credit and resources of the individual in a community are known to practically every other individual in that community. In this country no such actual information is obtainable. In Germany the small farmer, his wife, and children all do manual work on the farm; in this country such a condition is rare. In Germany the people have been trained to a supervision and control of their operation by strict Government regulations, which would not be favored in this country.

I trust that the preceding statement will be weighed. It was true when written and it is true to-day, and it points out clearly why we can not expect to make a cooperative system work in this country.

If the system proposed by the committee protects the borrower and still attracts capital, it follows that a system in which there is no private incentive to gain, and which has a Government guaranty, would afford far greater protection. Compare the two systems and the answer is self-evident.

If Government aid is unwise, why establish a Government bureau under the bill advocated by the commission? We need Government aid and direct Government control to make any system provide the benefits needed at the earliest possible moment. The needs of business—that is, commercial business—have been cared for in part since the passage of the national bank act, and are wholly provided for by the Federal reserve act. That being the case, why should the business of farming, the greatest of all, be asked to wait for many years before relief can be granted? The need is now, and in the interest of the farmers now living, and not wholly for those who will come in the years far ahead. The increase in the number of tenant farmers must be stopped if there is to be any real advantage to the farmers of America. The bill favored by the commission may or may not stop this increase. The bill which I have introduced would stop it with certainty. Why, then, should we hesitate in making choice between the problematic and the certainty, the more especially when the certainty would not, in all probability, entail any financial loss upon the Government or be a drain upon all of the people of the country? There is no class legislation in the system proposed by me any more than there was in the national banking act or in the Federal reserve act; and as we have legislated for the banker, merchant, and manufacturer, they should be the first to favor legislation for the farmer, on whose prosperity their own must inevitably rest.

Laying aside the doubt as to the probability of the banks provided for in the bill recommended by the commission being financed, I wish to pay attention to the slight possibility of any real relief coming to the farmers in case they are financed.

At a meeting of the Southern Conference for Education at Chattanooga, Tenn., the last week in April, it was shown that while the average farm profits in the United States are 5 per cent, the farmer pays from 8 to 16 per cent for the money he borrows, and that in the aggregate the farmers pay \$200,000,000 more per year in interest on their debts than the entire commercial world.

I trust that you will weigh that statement and fully appreciate its significance. To those who pay 8 to 16 per cent in interest the passage of the bill proposed by the commission would apparently bring relief. But that relief has no basis in truth. As long as the farms of the country earn only 5 per cent, the payment of 6 per cent for mortgage loans means ultimate disaster. A higher interest rate would only accelerate the coming of ruin, and any rate in excess of 5 per cent would mean industrial death, either from lingering illness at a rate of 6 per cent or a quick demise brought about by an interest rate of 8 to 16 per cent.

That time has passed when a mortgage debt on land is looked upon as evidence of disaster. The up-to-date farmer borrows so that he may increase the earning power of his investment, and that is fully shown in the statement of mortgage debt given. The farming States whose prosperity is acknowledged, such as Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana, are shown in the table given as carrying the heaviest burden of debt.

On the other hand, look at conditions in the South, where interest rates are high. Alabama, with nearly 54,000 more tenants than owners operating their lands, has a mortgage debt of

only \$10,350,577. Does that spell prosperity or adversity? Look at the figures in the following table for Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, Florida, and Georgia and you are forced to the conclusion which I have long since reached. The interest rate is keeping the landowners of the South in a state of economic slavery, and the landowner, North and South, will never reach his full growth until you remove the interest eaters from off of his back.

I desire here to insert a table showing the mortgage debt of each State according to the census of 1910, also the number of farms operated by owners and by tenants, and I particularly desire to call the attention of the Representatives from the South to the significance of that table.

Mortgage debt by States—Number of tenants and of farms operated by owners.

State.	Farms operated by owners.	Tenants.	Mortgage debt.
Alabama	\$104,575	153,326	\$10,350,577
Arizona	8,366	861	2,253,252
Arkansas	107,412	107,266	8,941,332
California	70,049	18,148	60,036,660
Colorado	37,780	8,390	18,988,026
Connecticut	24,183	2,612	11,859,468
Delaware	4,301	4,335	3,068,721
District of Columbia	133	84	56,100
Florida	38,674	13,342	2,709,970
Georgia	100,047	190,950	10,988,409
Idaho	27,619	3,188	14,557,103
Illinois	147,493	104,379	115,790,646
Indiana	153,798	64,687	57,488,582
Iowa	134,929	82,115	204,242,722
Kansas	112,443	65,398	70,819,736
Kentucky	171,325	87,860	23,411,430
Louisiana	53,939	66,607	8,950,301
Maine	57,453	2,563	11,738,529
Maryland	34,507	14,416	15,673,773
Massachusetts	33,938	2,979	16,371,484
Michigan	174,271	32,689	75,907,030
Minnesota	123,326	32,811	77,806,283
Mississippi	92,891	181,491	13,381,306
Missouri	194,286	82,958	112,565,406
Montana	23,870	2,344	10,741,280
Nebraska	80,237	49,441	62,373,472
Nevada	2,356	333	1,464,081
New Hampshire	25,174	1,879	4,773,610
New Jersey	25,193	8,294	19,476,938
New Mexico	33,719	1,967	2,590,282
New York	170,725	44,872	97,309,848
North Carolina	146,438	107,287	9,958,389
North Dakota	63,695	10,664	47,841,587
Ohio	194,857	77,188	63,788,397
Oklahoma	86,055	104,137	27,384,765
Oregon	38,643	6,859	21,165,627
Pennsylvania	168,190	51,105	61,539,433
Rhode Island	4,338	954	1,356,325
South Carolina	65,213	111,221	10,109,072
South Dakota	58,413	19,231	32,771,359
Tennessee	144,951	101,061	12,626,330
Texas	198,195	219,575	76,089,272
Utah	19,956	1,720	4,564,175
Vermont	28,701	4,008	12,436,091
Virginia	135,289	48,729	15,440,291
Washington	48,466	7,726	25,644,551
West Virginia	76,850	19,835	5,502,513
Wisconsin	152,473	24,654	140,815,513
Wyoming	10,080	897	4,207,981

Having reached the conclusion that an interest rate of 6 per cent will not afford permanent relief, we are confronted with these problems:

- Can we secure a lower rate?
- Can we do so and safeguard the loaner?
- Can we do so without loss to the Government?
- Can we do so without inflating the currency?

In answer I would ask that the questioner study carefully the measure introduced by me and find out wherein it fails to meet objections or is economically weak.

It does not contemplate the imposition of any new or untried theory. We can only be guided by the lamp of experience, and I wish to call your attention to a few facts which are pertinent in this connection.

The official report of New Zealand, issued November 30, 1912, shows that from the time the Government began to make loans to settlers in 1895 up to March 31, 1912, loans had been made to 32,783 settlers to the amount of over \$60,000,000 and only 33 of the mortgages had been foreclosed. Of the loans made, 17,897 were still outstanding and 14,886, 45 per cent of all loans made, had been repaid to the Government.

Turning to American experience we find that Idaho had \$1,500,000 outstanding in farm loans in 1912 and had been making such loans for 20 years. In all of that time there have not been over a half dozen foreclosures and the State has not sustained the loss of one cent.

From 1907 to June 1, 1912, North Dakota has made 983 loans at 5 per cent to the amount of \$1,646,462.85, and the officer reporting says:

There has been one mortgage foreclosure and the land was sold afterwards on contract at a profit to the State. The State has never lost a cent by such investments.

Oklahoma has been loaning to the farmers since 1907 and in 1912 had about \$4,000,000 so loaned. Up to that time no foreclosures had been made, and the only change contemplated was one to lengthen the term of loans from 5 to 10 years.

In summing up from the experience of the world, Hon. B. B. Hare, of the United States Department of Agriculture, says:

I will only say that the theory of issuing State bonds or the establishment of a State land-mortgage bank by which the bonds are to be issued to supply the needs of the farmers or tenants is amply justified by the experience and practice of the New Zealand, Australia, Canadian, Norwegian, and Philippine Governments, and the feasibility of granting such loans under either plan is thoroughly justified by the experience of eight of the American States.

Here we have fact and not theory. If the experiences related have been so successful, and they are not questioned, how much more certain of success would be the plan outlined in the measure introduced by me, where the bonds have an added value by reason of the privileges granted, by the soundness of the guaranty and the strength of the assets behind them, and where the expense of operation would be held down to a minimum and the debtor have the lightest possible load to carry.

In 1880 the percentage of tenant farmers in the United States was 25.6.

In 1890 the percentage increased to 28.4.

In 1900 it was 35.3.

And in 1910 it was 37.

Showing a steady gain and holding out no hope of encouragement.

In 1890 the number of farms mortgaged was 875,052. In 1900 it was 1,093,164, and in 1910 it reached the number of 1,312,034.

The amount of the mortgage debt reported in 1910 was \$1,721,172,851, but this report covers only the farms operated by owners and does not include those operated by tenants.

I will not tire you with unnecessary statistics. I have quoted only enough to show you the present conditions as nearly as possible. I will now analyze the measure I have introduced and you can judge if it will bring the relief needed.

The first 13 sections of this act deal with the necessary machinery for the conduct of the business. In short, they provide for a national land-bank comptroller, at a salary of \$5,000 per year; a deputy comptroller, at a salary of \$3,500 per year; not more than 12 national land-bank managers, each to receive \$3,500 per year; a deputy land-bank manager in each district, to receive, \$2,500 per annum. Also the necessary clerical force.

Section 16 provides that loans can be made only for the following purposes:

First. To pay off existing indebtedness.

Second. To improve farm property owned by the applicant.

Third. To pay part of the purchase money for land, and the mortgage may in such case cover the land so purchased.

Fourth. To purchase live stock and grain or farm implements.

Section 17 limits all loans to first mortgages, provides that no loan shall be made in excess of 50 per cent of the appraised value of the land and that no loan shall be made in excess of \$10,000, preference being given to those wishing to borrow \$5,000 or less.

Section 18 provides for the calling in of a loan when the terms of same have not been complied with.

Section 19 covers the appraisal of the lands and the conveying of mortgages under the terms of the act.

Section 20 provides for the establishment of rules and regulations for the registration of land titles, conveyance of lands, and the waiving of exemptions in executing mortgages. In case any group of States comprising a national land-bank district shall incorporate these rules and regulations into law the interest rate in such district shall be 4 per cent, and the comptroller is given power to form such districts whenever a sufficient number of States, contiguous in territory, have so legislated.

Section 21 provides that all postmasters shall, when called upon, make report as to the manner in which the borrower is living up to the terms of his loan and conserving the security of the same. Such reports to be made without charge, except that said postmasters shall be given the amount of actual expenses incurred.

Section 23 provides that the comptroller shall from time to time, as needed, issue bonds to each of the national land banks. These bonds to be secured by mortgages or deeds of trust made to the comptroller as trustee for the United States.

Section 24 provides that said bonds shall carry an interest rate of 3½ per cent per annum. They are to be secured by all

of the mortgage security of the bank which issues them and are to be free from taxation, National, State, county, or municipal.

Section 25 provides that all loans are to be made in bonds, or the national land-bank manager may dispose of same in open market, giving to the borrower the full amount received for such bonds.

Section 26 gives to the borrowers the option of paying off the loan after one year has elapsed, and gives the option of paying same in cash or in bonds issued in the same year in which the loan was made.

Section 27 gives to the comptroller the power to call in bonds at par at such time as he deems advisable.

Section 28 makes provision for the retirement of bonds from time to time as interest and amortization payments accumulate.

Section 29 limits the interest rate on mortgages to 4½ per cent, except as provided for in section 20.

Section 31 provides that loans can be made for any period between 5 and 40 years. All loans made for a period in excess of 10 years to be based on the amortization plan.

Section 32 gives to the land-bank manager and comptroller the power to extend the period for the payment of principal and interest for a period of not more than one year in case of crop failure or other causes beyond the control of the mortgagor.

Section 33 provides for the collection of loans and for foreclosure when such action is necessary.

Section 34 makes it incumbent upon land-bank managers to issue monthly statements as to the condition of the banks and to give full publicity to same.

Section 36 makes the land-bank bonds eligible:

First. As security for the deposit of postal savings funds.

Second. As a legal investment for time deposits of national banking associations.

Third. As a legal investment for trust funds and estates under the charge of the courts of the United States.

Fourth. As a security for loans from national banks under the provisions of section 24 of the Federal reserve act.

Section 37 makes provision for loans upon farm buildings and improvements up to 20 per cent of their valuation, provided that same are insured and such insurance assigned to the comptroller as trustee for the United States.

Section 39 provides for the use of the joint earnings of all banks for the purpose of paying the expenses of all. All sums in excess of the amount needed for expense to be returned to the borrowers in land-bank districts which have earned a profit.

Section 41 stipulates that the United States shall guarantee the payment of all principal and interest of loans procured under this act.

The preceding covers all salient points of the measure proposed. It does not inflate the currency, and while the security behind the loans is equal to the best provided for in the bill recommended by the commission this measure gives far greater security to the investor in the bonds.

But the greatest advantage offered by the proposed measure is that it would at once bring relief to the farmers and not hold out to them possible advantages in the years to come. We are dealing with conditions, and if we are not to have a tremendous increase in tenant farmers in the United States we must at once make provision to finance the needs of agriculture.

The question will naturally arise: Can such a measure be put in operation without loss to the Government? I am convinced that it can, and I would like to call your attention to one possible district land bank, covering four States:

State.	Farmed by owners.	By tenants.	Mortgage debt.
Iowa.....	134,929	82,115	\$204,242,722.00
Kansas.....	112,442	65,398	70,819,706.00
Missouri.....	194,286	82,958	112,565,406.00
Nebraska.....	80,237	49,441	62,373,472.00
Total amount mortgage debt in 4 States.			450,001,306.00
1 per cent on above.....			4,500,013.06

At one-fourth of 1 per cent the amount of mortgage debt would more than pay the expense of 12 regional land banks and the necessary Washington machinery.

And as interest rates range from 6 per cent upward, a rate of 4½ per cent would mean an approximate saving to landowners of \$11,250,000 annually in these four States alone.

It can not be pointed out how any possible land bank can be operated at a loss, and far from the Government being called upon to make its guaranty good at a financial loss there is every reason to believe that the system would from the out-

set show a healthy financial gain and a return of excess profits to the borrowers.

If the security provided for in the bill suggested by the commission is good, then the security provided for in the measure I offer is better. If it is not good, then it invites disaster, and we should not offer to the farmers of the country a half-way measure. We have promised them relief and it is for us to give it to them in generous measure and not ask them to be content with the drippings which may fall from the table of the interest-seeking Dives.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes next Tuesday morning after the reading of the Journal and the transaction of routine business on the subject of preparedness and international peace.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that next Tuesday after the reading of the Journal and the clearing up of the business on the Speaker's table he may be allowed to address the House for 45 minutes on preparedness and kindred subjects. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, it is probable that next week there will be an appropriation bill, an urgent deficiency bill, that will demand the urgent attention of the House; and perhaps even then, under the consideration of that bill, there will be time for general debate, when the gentleman can get in, but at this time I do not think it is advisable to give that permission so far in advance.

The SPEAKER. Of course, all of these speeches that are made under unanimous consent are subject to the limitations not to interfere with appropriation bills or privileged matters.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it is not to interfere with privileged bills, I will not insist upon the objection.

Mr. LONDON. I so understand my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate bill was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

S. 52. An act to provide for a commission to codify and suggest amendments to the general mining laws.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 14, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination, plan, and estimate of cost of improvement of South Fork of Edisto River, S. C., to a point opposite the city of Springfield (H. Doc. No. 559); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Shallotte River, N. C., with a view to the extension of the improvement to the town of Shallotte (H. Doc. No. 560); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a suggestion of an amendment to be incorporated in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, referring to estimate for "Contingent and miscellaneous expense, Naval Observatory, 1917" (H. Doc. No. 561); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for fuel, lights, repairs, etc., State, War, and Navy Department Building, Navy Department Annex, fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 562); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered against the Government by the district courts of the United States (H. Doc. No. 563); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting communications from the Assistant Attorney General sub-

mitting lists of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of claimants in Indian depredation cases (H. Doc. No. 564); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Postmaster General submitting urgent estimate of deficiencies in appropriations for the Postal Service, payable from postal revenues, for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 565); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims from various departments of the Government (H. Doc. No. 566); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedule of claims allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund (H. Doc. No. 567); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the Navy Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 568); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the commissioner of the Freedman's Savings & Trust Co., transmitting the annual report for the commissioner (ex officio) of the Freedman's Savings & Trust Co. for the year ending December 1, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 569); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report as to the rents received from properties located on sites of proposed public buildings purchased by the United States Government in this city (H. Doc. No. 570); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of Gen. William L. Marshall, consulting engineer of the Secretary of the Interior, on proposed plan for the protection of lands and property in the Imperial Valley, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 586); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

14. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting urgent estimates of deficiencies in appropriations for foreign intercourse, Department of State, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 572); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting an urgent estimate of appropriation for necessary repairs to the United States Coast and Geodetic steamer *Explorer* (H. Doc. No. 573); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SLAYDEN, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) authorizing the American Society of Civil Engineers to erect a memorial to Alfred Noble in the city of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 39), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3323) granting a pension to John P. Moore; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4368) granting a pension to A. E. Simmons; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4370) granting a pension to Sylvis Garver; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6309) granting a pension to Everett L. Thomas; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7189) granting an increase of pension to Eugene S. Staub; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3790) granting an increase of pension to Laura N. Thomson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4347) granting an increase of pension to John R. Perrine; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4560) granting an increase of pension to Francis T. Powell; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7095) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Foley; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 8909) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Ticonderoga, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8910) to amend the acts to regulate commerce, so as to provide that publishers of newspapers and periodicals may enter into advertising contracts with common carriers and receive payment for such advertisements in transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8911) to authorize the Postmaster General of the United States to establish employment exchanges at all presidential post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8912) to reduce the rate of postage on first-class mail matter mailed for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8913) prohibiting Senators, Representatives, or Delegates from receiving compensation or acting as counsel in certain matters where the United States is interested, or for parties or corporations engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8914) providing for the destruction of predatory wild animals upon the national forests and the lands adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8915) to appropriate money for the erection of an ordnance and munition plant in the fourth congressional district of Colorado; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8916) to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in any ship, naval station, or building used, controlled, or owned by the United States Government; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8917) to regulate the collection of special taxes now provided for by law against retail dealers in liquors and wholesale dealers in liquors, and the issuance of receipts and licenses to such dealers in such manner as to restrict the issuance of such receipts and licenses to persons proposing to engage in such business in localities in which, under the laws obtaining in said locality, such business is not prohibited; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 8918) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building in the village of Wellsville, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8919) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Dunkirk, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8920) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building in the city of Lockhart, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 8921) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as the "Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 8922) for the erection of a Federal building at Newton, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8923) for the erection of a public building at Albia, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 8924) appropriating \$100,000 for the improvement of the Flint River, Ga., between a point at

or near Albany, Ga., to a point at or near Montezuma, Ga., or to such a point on said river above Montezuma, Ga., as may be useful for the purposes of navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8925) providing a survey of and for Flint River, Ga., from Albany, Ga., to the city of Montezuma, Ga., or to such a point above Montezuma, Ga., as may be deemed practicable for navigation on said river, and for its improvement for navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8926) to prohibit banks holding membership in the Federal Reserve System from receiving deposits when insolvent, and prescribing penalties therefor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 8927) providing for a site and public building for a post office at West Palm Beach, Palm Beach County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 8928) to amend section 7 of the act approved August 24, 1912, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 8929) authorizing a tax on gifts, legacies, and inheritances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONRY: A bill (H. R. 8930) providing for a survey of Shinnecock Bay, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 8931) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Council Grove, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 8932) to provide for the erection of a pedestal and base for a monument to William Proctor, jr., in the Smithsonian Grounds, at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 8933) to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to publicity of contributions and expenditures made for the purpose of influencing the nomination and election of candidates for the offices of Representative and Senator in the Congress of the United States, limiting the amount of campaign expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 8934) to raise revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8935) making provision for the further improvement of Pollock Rip Channel, Nantucket Sound, Mass.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 92) making it the duty of standing and subcommittees of the House to prepare and preserve records of all meetings of such committees or subcommittees, and said records or minutes shall be open to public inspection; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 101) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 102) excepting the Reclamation Service from the operations of section 5 of the act of Congress approved July 16, 1914; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 8936) granting an increase of pension to William K. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8937) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Cartwright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8938) granting an increase of pension to James J. Warfel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8939) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin L. Frye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 8940) granting a pension to Homer M. Fisher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 8941) for the relief of William Moseley, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8942) to provide for the payment of the claim of J. W. Johnson against the United States; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 8943) granting a pension to Minnia A. Withers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 8944) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. James; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8945) for the relief of John P. Chesley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 8946) granting an increase of pension to John O. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8947) for the relief of Webster Flanagan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 8948) granting a pension to Lena Hilker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8949) to remove the charge of desertion against Samuel Schenck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 8950) for the relief of Robert Hildebrand; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 8951) granting an increase of pension to Alford H. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 8952) to correct the military record of Bony Bengert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8953) granting an increase of pension to James Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8954) granting an increase of pension to Miles W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLEMAN: A bill (H. R. 8955) granting an extension of patent to Thomas A. Dicks; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CONNELLY: A bill (H. R. 8956) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONRY: A bill (H. R. 8957) to remove the charge of desertion against James Green; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8958) granting a pension to Nettie M. Fobes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 8959) granting an increase of pension to Emma Evarts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 8960) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Grogan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 8961) for the relief of Joseph H. Lawrence; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 8962) for the relief of W. J. Laffoon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 8963) granting a pension to Minnie A. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8964) granting an increase of pension to Henry Neely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGLE: A bill (H. R. 8965) granting an increase of pension to Darling L. Peeples; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 8966) for the relief of the Jefferson Lime Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 8967) granting an increase of pension to James O'Connell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8968) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hatton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8969) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Nethercutt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8970) for the relief of James H. C. Mann; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8971) granting an increase of pension to John Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 8972) granting an increase of pension to David W. Corson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8973) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Hummel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 8974) granting an honorable discharge to Henry S. Hunter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 8975) granting a pension to Anton E. Sauter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 8976) for the relief of Elizabeth Marsh Watkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 8977) granting an increase of pension to Lucy L. Wessels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 8978) granting a pension to William Butts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8979) to remove the charge of desertion against Orrin F. Strickland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 8980) granting a pension to John Bleiweiss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8981) for the relief of Charles Lauber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8982) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah Champ; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 8983) granting a pension to Josephine Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 8984) granting a pension to William B. Stroope; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8985) to correct the military record of Robert M. Adams, deceased; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8986) authorizing the payment of salary due to J. A. McCreary, of Forestville, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 8987) granting a pension to George W. Blanton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8988) granting a pension to G. W. H. Kimbler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8989) to correct the military record of John F. Rudd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8990) granting a pension to John P. Hazlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8991) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 8992) granting an increase of pension to John W. Whitaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 8993) granting a pension to Frank Haight, dependent son of Frederick G. Haight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 8994) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8995) granting an increase of pension to Clara J. Emerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 8996) to correct the military record of Robert Zink; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 8997) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Welch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 8998) granting an increase of pension to George W. Noble; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8999) granting a pension to Mary J. Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 9000) granting an increase of pension to David W. Bogard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9001) granting an increase of pension to William H. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9002) granting an increase of pension to Orrin P. Gay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9003) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Fronefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 9004) granting an increase of pension to Julia W. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 9005) granting an increase of pension to W. G. Mahaffey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9006) granting an increase of pension to Martha R. Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9007) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Ebert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 9008) granting a pension to Helen Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9009) granting a pension to Daniel Burkey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9010) granting an increase of pension to John Cotner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9011) granting an increase of pension to James W. Tuckerman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9012) granting an increase of pension to Robert Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9013) granting an increase of pension to Absalom Shell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9014) for the relief of John O. Kinney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9015) granting a pension to John E. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 9016) granting a pension to Sarah E. Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 9017) granting a pension to Sarah M. Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 9018) granting a pension to Leando N. Muck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9019) granting a pension to Mary D. Holbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9020) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Shamp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9021) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Merritt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9022) granting a pension to John M. Riddick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9023) granting an increase of pension to Tillie Bucklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 9024) granting a pension to Anna C. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9025) granting an increase of pension to Richard Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9026) granting an increase of pension to Norman W. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9027) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Casteel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9028) granting a pension to John Shanks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9029) restoring the name of Sarah E. Wilson to the pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 9030) for the relief of Alexander W. Hoffman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9031) for the relief of the Mutual Transit Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9032) for the relief of George Deitz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9033) for the relief of Augustus C. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9034) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Quinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9035) for the relief of the Lackawanna Steel Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9036) for the relief of Sidney G. Sherwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9037) granting an increase of pension to Peter Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 9038) granting a pension to Leroy E. Cuckow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9039) granting an increase of pension to James H. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 9040) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Parks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 9041) for the relief of Charlie George and Albert Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9042) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Brasher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of association to abolish war, urging that the military and naval organizations be not increased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petitions of Stenographers' and Bookkeepers' Association, urging legislation to prevent citrus canker; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALLEN: Memorial of Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, protesting against United States Government selling defense supplies to the Cuban Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 8832, for relief of Felix R. Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET: Petition of 50,000 citizens of the United States, praying for an embargo on arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEALES: Petition of Col. Edwin B. Watts Camp, No. 68, Department of Pennsylvania, favoring passage of the Key bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, protest of the International Union of the United Brewery Workmen, against the passage of a Nation-wide prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of Brickner Woolen Mills Co., Sheboygan Falls, Wis., asking for legislation which will make this country independent of any other nation for dyestuffs in times of peace and high explosives in times of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of Electrical Supply Jobbers' Association, indorsing the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of James Carey, of New York City, in favor of House bill 4771, seeking classification of post-office laborers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Manhattan Camp, No. 1, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring House bill 54, a bill to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers accompanying House joint resolution 87, for the relief of Edward B. Craig; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: Petition of sundry citizens of Edgefield, S. C., protesting against passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of Citizens' Northwest Suburban Association, protesting against an increase in salaries of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Shepard Norwell Co., of Boston, Mass., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of Mohawk Silk Fabric Co., of New York, favoring enactment of House bill 702, relative to the protection of the American dyestuff industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Atlas Knitting Co., of Amsterdam, N. Y., for legislation protecting the dyestuff industry in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX: Petition of citizens of the United States, asking for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the Sisal Trust of Yucatan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COPLEY: Papers to accompany House bill 7737, for the relief of Frederick J. Fadner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of firms of Tracy, Cal., favoring the enactment of a bill to provide a tax upon persons, firms, and corporations doing an interstate mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the American Neutrality and Peace Convention at San Francisco, Cal., relative to violation of neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Shepard Noowell Co., of Boston, Mass., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, favoring repeal of the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Wilson & Toomer Fertilizer Co., of Jacksonville, Fla., favoring fund for fighting citrus canker; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of knitting manufacturers of central West, favoring protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of Morocco Manufacturers' Association, of Philadelphia, favoring legislation to encourage the manufacture of dyes in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of Kent Manufacturing Co., of New York, favoring House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Traffic Club of New York, favoring and urging the immediate repeal of the seamen's act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of National Lodge, No. 556, International Association of Machinists, Government employees, protesting against the small increase of 8 cents per day for machinists employed at New York Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of National Lodge, No. 556, International Association of Machinists, Government employees, protesting against small increase of 8 cents a day for machinists employed at New York Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of Citizens' Northwest Suburban Association, of Tenleytown, D. C., protesting against an increase of salaries of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, requesting the unconditional repeal of the seaman's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Citizens' Northwest Suburban Association, of Tenleytown, D. C., protesting against the transfer of the board of education; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, favoring repeal of the seamen's law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the American Neutrality and Peace Convention, at San Francisco, Cal., relative to violation of neutrality by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of citizens of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Illinois Butter Manufacturers' Improvement Association for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Oglesby, Ill., against large appropriation for preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of business men of Marion, Tex., favoring taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORDON: Petitions signed by Edward Montgomery and 96 other citizens of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, protesting against any additional taxes upon the beer and liquor industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. B. Lewis, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring change of policy in Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Great Western Oil Co., protesting against any additional tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 8721, granting a pension to William E. Warren; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8722, granting a pension to Louise (Jones) Nesmith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8724, granting an increase of pension to Joseph McNeight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8725, granting an increase of pension to Levi E. Morey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8726, granting an increase of pension to Lewis A. Clemons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8723, granting an increase of pension to John A. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATON: Petition of Edward J. Maginnis, of Girardville, Pa., protesting against the Keating child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Josephine Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of German-American Alliance of Bridgeport, Ohio, in favor of embargo on arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of the Traffic Club, of New York, favoring repeal of the seamen's law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEE: Papers to accompany House bill 8566, granting an increase of pension to Nancy Humphreys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Royalton, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Frederick G. Haight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Evidence in support of House bill 8747, granting a pension to Clarence E. Gleason; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence to support House bill 8749, granting an increase of pension to Daniel Houts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 4378, to correct the military record of George Andrews; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 4373, to grant an increase of pension to Oliver P. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8748, granting a pension to Albert L. Funk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8750, granting an increase of pension to Esther A. Karschner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8751, granting an increase of pension to John Love; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8752, granting an increase of pension to Daniel McManawa; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8753, granting an increase of pension to Fred Porter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sitka, praying for prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of Chicago, favoring creation of a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petition of 119 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution adopted at a mass meeting held at St. Louis, Mo., on December 6, protesting against the cruel treatment of Jews in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of the National Association of Piano Merchants of America, favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring embargo on shipment of war material; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of W. G. Mahaffey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Shaugnessy Knitting Co., of Watertown, N. Y., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of the American Association for Labor Legislation, urging the passage of House bill 476, to provide an adequate system of workmen's compensation for injured employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OGLESBY: Petition of Bronx Chapter, Daughters of American Revolution, indorsing National Security League of Mount Vernon, N. Y., favoring national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of International Wood Carvers' Association, of Boston, Mass., favoring passage of House bill 4770, a bill to provide for labeling, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Commissioners of Inland Fisheries, favoring appropriation for extending work of United States Bureau of Fisheries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Rear Admiral Charles M. Thomas Camp No. 3, Department of Rhode Island United Spanish War Veterans, favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Troop C, First Squadron Cavalry, Rhode Island National Guards, Providence Armory, favoring bill to convert National Guard into a Federal force; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Rhode Island Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, favoring passage of House bill 743, for building for Department of Justice; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petition of the Congregational Sunday School and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Norwalk, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Norwalk, Ohio, asking that the exportation of rum, etc., to Africa and sale of liquors to the Philippines and Hawaii be prohibited; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Congregational Sunday School and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Norwalk, Ohio, asking for Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petitions of Congregational Sunday School and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwalk, Ohio, asking for the amendment of certain sections of the pure food and drugs act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Great Western Oil Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petitions of Thayer Woolen Co., Sayles-Jenk Manufacturing Co., and Folley Woolen Mills, all of Massachusetts, favoring protection for American dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER: Petitions of sundry business men of the State of Illinois, favoring taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of L. H. Drake, of Elmira, N. Y., favoring the Townsend volunteer officers' bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany House bill 7411, to increase pension of John Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8199, for relief of Dora Nickerson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Kalamazoo Advertising Co. and Merchants Publishing Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich., protesting against extension of lottery laws affecting merchandise and premiums going through mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of the El Paso County Retail Grocers' and Butchers' Association, of Colorado Springs, Colo., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Corporal William White Camp, No. 4, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petitions of S. N. & C. Russell Manufacturing Co.; A. H. Rice & Co., of Pittsfield; and W. C. Plunkett & Sons, of Adams, Mass., favoring protection for manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of citizens of the towns of Mount Ayr, Kellerton, Centerville, Humeston, Garden Grove, Corydon, Seymour, Moulton, Sewal, Harvard, Allerton, Leon, Lamoni, Davis City, Decatur, Van Wert, Lineville, Pleasanton, Numa, Moravia, Cincinnati, Exline, Osceola, Chariton, Mystic, Jerome, Tingley, Ellston, Arispe, Blockton, Maloy, Benton, Diagonal, Grand River, Talmage, Murray, Lorimor, Afton, Shannon City, Promise City, Derby, Le Roy, Weldon, Redding, Russell, and Lucas, all of the eighth district of Iowa, favoring legislation to provide a tax upon persons, firms, or corporations doing an interstate mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of employees of the Chadwick-Haskins Co., mills No. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, against the Keating-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of citizens of Meridian, Mass., favoring resolution for woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.